50¢
T53

WAS HOLY COMMUNION INSTITUTED BY JESUS?

A CANDID ENQUIRY

BY

DOUGLAS S. GUY, B.D.

VICAR OF CHRIST CHURCH, HARROGATE
HON. CANON OF RIPON AND RURAL DEAN
AUTHOR OF "STEPS TOWARDS INTERCOMMUNION," "SACRIFICE IN HOLY COMMUNION"

WITH A FOREWORD BY

THE RT. REV. THE BISHOP OF RIPON

LONDON
STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT
32 RUSSELL SQUARE, W.C. 1
1924

First published APRIL, 1924

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

FOREWORD

I AM asked to write a few words of introduction to the following work by my friend Canon Guy. It deals with a question long under discussion in "higher critical" regions, but, perhaps, somewhat strange to the ordinary reader. Canon Guy's study deals only with the one point raised in the title, but it raises questions which run far back into current religious ideas. It raises the question of the character and method of interpretation of the Holy Scripture, and of the value and trustworthiness of the witness of the Church. The book is the result, as the lists of authorities show, of considerable research; but it aims at a wider class of readers than that of professional theologians or critics. It aims at making clear to the ordinary reader the sort of problems of which he has probably heard, but of the details of which he knows comparatively little. For this reason Canon Guy states and restates the necessity of dealing with all such questions in a spirit of straightforward enquiry—more fully, perhaps, than would be required in a book appealing merely to professional students. There can be little doubt that books of this kind are greatly desirable. Inevitable changes have taken place in respect of many beliefs once thought certain, and it is of the greatest importance that efforts should be made to

show what has happened and what the effect of it is likely to be. Canon Guy has endeavoured to show the result of much discussion upon one point—viz., the institution of the Holy Eucharist. To do this is, in itself, to do a great service to the Church at the present time. And I would urge, further, that a study of such a subject by a man who has for more than thirty years been engaged in the practical administration of a parish has a right to be carefully considered. He is likely to know from the inside, in a way that a purely academic student may not know, what the inward and spiritual aspect of such a question as the present is likely to be. He can bring to the study of texts and historical documents and the books of the Bible a long and varied knowledge of the actual function of the Eucharist in the modern life of the Church. I hope that his book will receive a cordial welcome.

THOMAS RIPON.

January, 1924.

PREFACE

"The test of the truth of the tradition is that it can bear the whole light."—GORE: *The Spirit and the Church.*

IT will be well at the outset to explain the object and the limitations of what follows, more especially as I know of no other treatise which sets out to deal with the same subject from quite the same standpoint. I write in the hope of interesting not only clergy and ministers and teachers of religion generally, but also any thoughtful students of Theology —*e.g.*, such as range themselves in the present day under the Student Christian Movement banner. I am particularly anxious to invite my Free Church friends and all those who, for whatever reason, are at present fighting shy of institutional religion, to consider impartially what is here said. Institutionalism, as everyone must allow, has so often been pressed with undue and even tyrannical insistence, that it has produced a natural, but an exaggerated, reaction. But we can already discern symptoms of a return to a more normal condition. In the matter before us, we are brought face to face with Institutionalism at its very core. Moreover, I hold, and have ventured to urge elsewhere,* that reunion will be facilitated, and intercommunion hastened, by our studying together this great subject of Holy Communion in all its bearings.

* *Steps towards Intercommunion; Sacrifice in Holy Communion*, p. xii, Heffer and Sons.

As we endeavour to find out how much common belief we can attain, it may once more vindicate for us its splendid title, which though not a New Testament one, has deservedly won its way into even more general use than some other designations of the rite, which bring before us other aspects of it.* "The Lord's Supper" (*cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 20, though there only) and "the Eucharist" each bear their special witness, but Holy Communion does in a remarkable way sum up certain salient features which Jesus and the early Christians clearly attached to the rite. Without question, Jesus regarded it originally as a means of common union of ourselves with Himself, and thus with each other, and it was this primarily which led to its becoming so general a custom. All Christians should be able to share it in common. If this book conduces at all to that, I shall be richly rewarded for my labours. I propose to consider here a very small portion of the Eucharistic problems, nevertheless one which lies behind, and determines the value of all the rest. It is the problem of the institution, or of the ultimate origin, of the Eucharist. Did Jesus institute the Holy Communion? To those who are unaware that such a problem exists, or who prefer to ignore it, I commend the contents of Chapter I., and also the following words, from a writer, using a pseudonym, who has recently secured a great reading public,† words which, while I hold them to be somewhat inaccurate and exaggerated, yet contain a useful note of warning:

* *Cf.* note at end of Preface.

† *A Gentleman with a Duster. Painted Windows.*

"Ahead lies a struggle likely to be of a more desperate character than its two forerunners (viz., verbal inspiration, and the person of Jesus), the battle over sacramental Christianity. Already in France and Germany the question is asked, Did Jesus institute any Sacraments at all? But even in these two countries the battle has not yet begun in real earnest, while over here only readers of Lake and Kennedy are dimly aware of a coming storm. That storm will concern rites which few orthodox Christians have ever regarded as heathen in their spirit, though some have come to know they are pagan in origin. It is not wise to ignore the future struggle, but our main responsibility is to bear a manful part in the struggle which is now upon us."

Thousands of treatises have appeared to determine the exact meaning of the injunction, believed to have been uttered by Jesus at the Last Supper, "This do in remembrance of Me." Each word in that injunction, especially the second and the fourth (in our English translation), has provided scope for quite an extensive variety of views. But, as the following pages will show, the attack is now being carried right home to the citadel, and it is seriously disputed whether the words were ever spoken at all.

In Chapter I., there will be found, under five heads, the chief objections commonly urged in the present day against an affirmative response to the question in our Title. Then follow, with equal brevity, the lines of reply to such objections. The rest of the book is a further consideration under the same heads, of both sides of this problem. And inasmuch as many complete books

might, in each case, be devoted to the problem, I have tried to indicate in notes at the foot of a page, or at the close of a chapter, where fuller information may be found. My object is to suggest lines of thought and enquiry, rather than to attempt any exhaustive treatment. It is clearly a solemn and important subject, needing attention from scholars, even if the result of research cannot at present produce an altogether definite or final verdict.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

As "institution" and "words of institution" are used with different meanings by writers, it will be well to state here that the term "institution" is used of "what is appointed, prescribed, or founded by authority, and *intended to be permanent*." (*Webster's Dictionary*.)

DESIGNATIONS OF HOLY COMMUNION

New Testament descriptions of, or references to, this rite are "The Lord's Supper" (1 Cor. xi. 20); "the breaking of bread" (Acts ii. 42); "the cup of Blessing" (1 Cor. x. 16); "the communion of the Blood . . . of the Body of Christ" (1 Cor. x. 16). The term "Eucharist" arose quite early from the New Testament word (εὐχαριστεῖν) for giving thanks. "Mass" dates from the fourth century, and is derived from the Latin *mittere*, to dismiss, because of all but communicants being dismissed at the close of the service preceding it.

CONTENTS OF BOOK

PAGE

FOREWORD BY THE RT. REV. THE BISHOP OF RIPON - iii

PREFACE.—Aim of the Enquiry—To Whom the Book is Addressed - - - - - - v

CHAPTER I.—Negative Arguments under Five Heads, with Outline of Suggested Replies - - - - 1

CHAPTER II.—The Problem a Live and Pressing One—Doubt among Scholars whether Jesus Intended a Permanent Rite - - - - - - - 19

CHAPTER III.—Method of Approach to Problem—The Historical Method—Explanation of This—Various Layers of New Testament Tradition - - - 29

CHAPTER IV.—*A priori* Objections Considered—(*a*) The Argument from Eschatology; (*b*) and from Institutionalism—Was Jesus Anti-Institutional?—Two Notes - 39

CHAPTER V.—New Testament Records—Can they be Harmonized?—Note on Eastern Thought—Comparison of New Testament Narratives - - - - 63

CHAPTER VI.—Date of Last Supper—The Synoptists and St. John—No Account in Latter—Four Appendices—A. Synoptic Date of Last Supper—B. A Free Church View—C. St. John and Christian Art—D. Note on "The Feeding of the 5,000" - - - - 77

CHAPTER VII.—St. Paul and the Institution—St. Paul the only New Testament Authority for Repeating the Rite—Value of his Testimony—Silence of Synoptists—Are St. Paul's Words of Institution History or Interpretation?—Appendices on (1) The Lucan Text; (2) "I received from the Lord"—Notes on the Silence of St. Mark, and the Didache - - - - 95

CONTENTS OF BOOK

PAGE

CHAPTER VIII.—Jesus Christ and St. Paul—Do they Preach the same Gospel?—Did St. Paul Found the Christian Religion?—Developments of Teaching in St. Paul—Notes on (1) "Knowing Christ after the Flesh"; (2) Two Treatises on "Jesus and Paul"; (3) Testimonies from German Scholars - - - - - 125

CHAPTER IX.—St. Paul and the Mysteries—Hellenism or Hebraism—Views of Loisy, Reitzenstein, Lake, and their Opponents—Resemblances and Differences—Difficulties to be Met—Note on St. Paul's Terminology - - 149

CHAPTER X.—The Acts and the Early Church—The Breaking of Bread—The Church Tradition of an Institution - 181

CHAPTER XI.—Review of Subject and Conclusions - - 193

CHAPTER XII.—Epilogue—Some Final Considerations - 207

CHAPTER I

NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ARGUMENTS

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER I

Question a surprise to many. Yet many scholars raising it. Did Jesus intend after-observance of Sacrament? Did St. Paul originate the Eucharist?

Five difficulties urged. (1) Jesus no institutionalist. He did not institute Baptism or the Church. (2) Jesus' apocalyptic expectations. (3) Various difficulties in Gospel narratives. (4) Difficulties connected with St. Paul. (*a*) What authority had he? (*b*) Jesus and St. Paul. (*c*) St. Paul and the mysteries. (5) Danger of literalism with regard to New Testament. Possible reply to each difficulty, indicating course to be taken in further chapters of book. Appeal to Church tradition to supplement New Testament.

CHAPTER I

NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ARGUMENTS

Was Holy Communion instituted by Jesus Christ?

The mere question will, perhaps, excite surprise. Most of us think that there is no tenet of our religion more immune from doubt than the one here called in question. Yet many earnest scholars, not only on the Continent, but in England too, have come to regard the matter as an open one. It is contended that Jesus was just celebrating a farewell meal, in which He speaks of His body being broken and His blood being shed, thereby implying His perfect readiness to die for those He loved, but that He said nothing about repeating or continuing it as a rite. That He was instituting something to be observed by after generations is credited to St. Paul, or regarded as at any rate an after-thought of the Church. Let us first mention some of the grounds which are alleged for this, and then those for the opposite opinion. I will put them as shortly and clearly as I can in this chapter and reserve till later a fuller treatment of each.

1. It is contended that Jesus was in no sense an institutionalist. It can be fairly argued that He did not institute anything. The Dean of St. Paul's distinctly asserts that He did not found the Christian

Church,* and many hold that it developed gradually from the Jewish Church in which Jesus grew up, and of which, when He passed from earth to heaven, He left His disciples members. It can equally well be argued that Jesus did not institute Christian Baptism, and that that also was taken over from Judaism. Most scholars agree that the concluding words of St. Matthew's Gospel concerning baptizing in the threefold Name are a summary and formula of Christian belief and practice of a later date rather than an exact repetition of what Jesus said.†

If these positions can be sustained, it is urged that we have a strong *a priori* ground for questioning

* *Outspoken Essays*, pp. 227, 249, etc.

† Many scholars feel that the Trinitarian baptismal formula does not accord with the practice of the early Church as found elsewhere, and the wording at least would seem not to be primitive. Dean Rashdall describes this conclusion as "a definite and unassailable result of modern criticism" (*Christus in Ecclesia*, 57). Dean Robinson in *Ency. Bibl.*, art. "Baptism," argues that seeing there is no synoptic parallel to this, from the documentary point of view the evidence is posterior to St. Paul's Epistles and the Acts, and that probably "St. Matthew" is not quoting the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, but transferring to Jesus the familiar language of the Church of his own time and locality. The language of the First Gospel does not exactly reproduce the earliest documents, and shows types of modifications of a later kind. Harnack, *Hist. Dogm.*, i., 79 n., and many scholars adopt the same view. For the opposite view *cf.* Bishop Chase, *J. Th. S.*, July, 1905, and vi., p. 481, and viii., p. 161. He suggests that these verses may represent the lost ending of St. Mark's Gospel. On the subject of the Baptismal Formula, *cf.* also Conybeare, *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1902; Swete, *Appearances* and *Holy Spirit*, 1909; and Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, pp. 268-284, where various objections are stated and authorities quoted.

the probability of Jesus instituting a rite on the eve of His death, especially if other evidence makes in the same direction, and that Jesus laid so little, if any, stress upon rites that it would seem more natural not to connect Him with the creation of this one.

2. Again, from the eschatological standpoint the fact of an institution is challenged. If Jesus, as many believe, shared the outlook of His age, and expected a speedy triumph and an immediate or approximate coming of the Kingdom, what need was there for His instituting a rite to be observed after His death?

3. There are said to be, moreover, various difficulties with regard to the Gospel records which seem to discredit their testimony.

(*a*) There are four Gospels. One of these (St. John), though giving a fuller account than the rest of the Last Supper, makes no mention of the *Lord's Supper*. If this event is of the import alleged, and meant to be universal and perpetual, why this omission?*

Moreover, the Fourth Gospel disagrees with the Synoptists in placing the Last Supper and the Crucifixion on the day before the Passover,† while the latter distinctly assign them to the day of the Passover. Such a discrepancy can be urged against the reliability of the Gospel records.

(*b*) None of the Gospels, omitting, as we must do for critical reasons, the longer Lucan Version

* *Cf.* Renan, *Vie de Jésus,* fourteenth edition, p. 401.

† It will be remembered that the Jewish day was from sunset to sunset.

(see Westcott and Hort's text),* states that our Lord directed that the rite should be continued. For such a statement we are driven to St. Paul's evidence, and that, for various reasons which we will set out shortly, is seriously challenged. If Jesus said the rite was to continue, why this silence?

(*c*) The result of careful study is to prove that it is impossible completely to harmonize the Gospel accounts of the Lord's Supper, or to determine what were the actual words spoken by Jesus. With the exception of "This is My Body," about which all agree, none of the records are in entire accord as to what was said. Therefore, if Jesus said what one writer makes Him say, He did not say exactly what another attributes to Him. Also, even in the Synoptists themselves there are traces of subsequent amplifications.

4. When we turn to St. Paul, we find even more puzzling problems. We have seen that, so far as the New Testament is concerned, it is upon his testimony alone that there depends any assurance that Jesus intended the rite to be perpetuated. In St. Paul's account Jesus twice enjoins His disciples to "do this in remembrance of" Him. The difficulties in accepting this as final are shortly as follows:

(*a*) St. Paul professes to have received his tradition of the Lord's Supper "from the Lord." But there is no general agreement as to whether by these words St. Paul means directly or indirectly "from the Lord"—*i.e.*, from the Lord by direct revela-

* *Cf.* also *H.D.B.*, Dr. Sanday's art. on "Jesus Christ," p. 636, and his "Outlines of the Gospel," pp. 157-160, and Frankland, *The Early Eucharist*, pp. 114-119.

tion, or through others as a medium, but ultimately from the Lord. Thus it is difficult to appraise at its proper value a claim, which in any case is necessarily unconfirmed, and can only depend upon his own authority. Also, it is uncertain whether St. Paul means that the words which follow in 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, were all actually spoken by the Lord, or whether he, according to a common custom of his days, is interpreting as well as recording the meaning and teaching of Jesus.

(*b*) If we are to accept as final St. Paul's authority for this injunction, we are left in a state of surprise that an apparently accidental reference to this important matter, produced by a passing phase of unseemly conduct in the Church of Corinth, should afford the sole ground for our believing that Jesus instructed His Church to observe this rite in future as His Memorial. We cannot help reflecting that some of St. Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians has probably been lost,* and we are driven to speculate what would have happened if the portion in which the account of the Lord's Supper occurs had shared the same fate. We tremble to think that our faith in so vital a matter could depend upon so thin a thread.

(*c*) Again, if we are led to derive our belief in an institution from this sentence of St. Paul, another problem arises. The whole question of the relationship of Paulinism to the teaching of Jesus, as the latter is found in the Synoptists, is raised, and especially here the apparently different outlook

* *Cf.* Maurice Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, where four Epistles are made out of our present two.

of Jesus and St. Paul in the matter of Sacraments. Even if we allow that the two great Sacraments were instituted by Jesus, it is alleged that St. Paul's sacramental teaching is a very much more developed one than that of Jesus.

Some scholars go further and hold that while Jesus only observed the Last Supper as a parting meal, it is to St. Paul that we owe its having become an abiding Sacrament of the Church. In any case, it is urged that under the circumstances St. Paul is hardly a safe guide in the matter, unless corroborated by others.

(*d*) Once more a large number of scholars contend that St. Paul's sacramental teaching was largely influenced by, even if not borrowed from, the heathen mysteries by which he was surrounded, and is to be traced to that source rather than to Jesus Himself.

5. A still further objection urged is that if, in order to prove the obligation of the Lord's Supper, we rest our appeal solely or chiefly upon the New Testament, such an appeal involves a literalism, which, in the case of the Sermon on the Mount, we at once reject, and we are reminded that an equally good case might be made for our Lord having enjoined us to wash one another's feet.

These are some of the chief objections which have been raised. I have tried to state them fairly and clearly. They will naturally vary in the strength of their appeal. I feel sure they should not be dismissed lightly. They gather around a rite which to the average Christian seems as simple as the space allotted to it in the Gospels is brief, and,

doubtless, in the brevity of that space lies much of our difficulty. In dealing with them, we must seek only to find the truth, and never to argue for victory only. Piety will not suffer by so doing, and "there is always a more important interest than that of piety, and that is truth."* Personally, I believe each one is capable of a satisfactory reply. Obviously, such a task requires a whole chapter to be devoted to each, and, therefore, in this preliminary statement, I will merely indicate briefly the lines on which I conceive that such a reply should rest.

1. As to Institutionalism, it is for our subject not a vital matter whether we hold that Jesus instituted and founded the Christian Church or not. It would be quite as true, if not more true, to say that He did as to say that He did not. All depends upon what we mean by the Church, and we should have to define our terms. In a very true sense the Christian Church is a development of the Jewish Church—"a divinely appointed issue and climax of the old."† In an equally true sense it is a new creation in the world, and its existence is certainly a product of the life and work of Jesus. Quite recently (1922) a joint memorandum on Reunion was issued by leading representatives of Anglicans and Free Churchmen, and they felt themselves justified in speaking of Christ founding a Church and instituting Sacraments. While

* The expression is Von Harnack's. It is hardly necessary to add that the two are so closely allied that they should never be separated, but where such separation has taken place, truth is the elder sister, who must be courted and won before piety is espoused.

† Dean of Wells, *Ency. Bibl.*, art. "Church."

Christian Baptism was, no doubt, a development of a Jewish custom—though the immediate antecedent was John's Baptism—it became in the hands of Jesus and His Church a new Christian rite—the spiritual element previously lacking having been added—and so could claim the authority of Jesus. All this shows excellently how Christianity fulfils without destroying. The same holds good of Holy Communion. It arose out of the bosom of the Jewish Church. The Last Supper gave birth to "the Lord's Supper," and most probably was itself only a climax of many meals Jesus had held with His disciples, though for obvious reasons marked off from them by special circumstances and solemn words and actions which would rightly lead on to its perpetuation.

2. It is not possible to discuss adequately the eschatological argument. The whole subject is *sub judice*. We must not overlook the indications of an entirely different strain of teaching from the lips of Jesus. At any rate, He distinctly disclaimed any knowledge of the day and hour of His final coming. Even if the interval was short or uncertain, as it obviously was, it would allow for the disciples cherishing and keeping His Memorial until He did come.

3. There is no question about the divergences of the Gospel narratives. It is not our business to extricate the New Testament writers from apparent contradictions, however much we may love and honour their records and wish to harmonize them. If we are honest we must recognize these differences, and adopt a view of inspiration which allows for

them. I feel sure that the results of literary, historical, and scientific criticism have been to make the Bible far more human and comprehensible, and a vastly richer possession. An illuminating doctrine of inspiration has been substituted for the mechanical doctrine of dictation. A dictated Bible could not be an inspired Bible, seeing that inspiration requires not only the breath of the Divine Spirit, but also the unfettered devotion of the human consciousness, with all its necessary limitations as well as its divine capacities. The point here is not whether the Evangelists give us the exact words spoken—many parallel instances of like divergence elsewhere could be pointed to—but whether their different brief records sufficiently agree to make an harmonious whole. And with the exception of the actual date, they undoubtedly do. This fact amidst a trifling variety of language is, to my mind, a more striking evidence of credibility than if they had been mere copyists. It is easy to account for the Fourth Gospel, which is avowedly supplementary,* omitting the Lord's Supper. Moreover, St. John vi. would seem to imply a knowledge of it. It is not so easy, though it is not impossible, to account for St. Mark omitting the injunction to continue the rite, if the words were spoken by Jesus at this time, and St. Matthew, of course, depends upon St. Mark. The text of St. Luke in this case is the despair of

* *Cf.* Headlam, *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*, p. 7, who asserts that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was also acquainted with the other three Gospels, and p. 153 where he says that "it is entirely in accordance with the method of the Gospel not to narrate what is known," but "to emphasize what has been passed over." *Cf.* also Schmiedel, *Ency. Bibl.*, ii. 2540.

scholars, but though the very earliest manuscripts do not contain the words which St. Paul adds in 1 Cor., on the other hand, as Dr. Sanday points out in *H.D.B.*, art. "Jesus Christ," the fuller text was current so early, and received such wide circulation that it may be regarded as even "stronger testimony of the current practice of the Church than that of a single writer could be, even though the writer was an Evangelist." And while we are unable to account completely for the silence of St. Mark as to future repetition of the rite, may we not say that the actions of Jesus on this occasion, and the words which accompany them as narrated in St. Mark's Gospel, do in themselves suggest something more than a passing occurrence, and do make a suitable and compelling background and starting-point to the way in which the early Church, evidently feeling herself to be carrying out her Master's purpose and observing His Memorial, was led to perpetuate the rite? In the fragmentary records we have, which, as more than once we are reminded, do not pretend to be complete, it is wonderful how much we are told. The Synoptists only devote two or three verses to the occasion, and where no detailed history of the rite or exposition of its meaning is attempted, criticism finds very little scope.

4. We come next to the difficulties which, it is alleged, gather around the witness of St. Paul. I do not think any of them sufficient to invalidate that witness. The question of what authority he claims in the words "from the Lord" is really immaterial. If he meant "by direct revelation," I

imagine few of us would dispute the possibility of such, though we might for various reasons think it unlikely. We believe St. Paul had a real revelation on the road to Damascus, which changed his whole life. If, as I strongly incline to believe, he meant that he received this teaching about the Lord's Supper from others—*i.e.*, some of the twelve—while he traced it ultimately to Jesus, then we have further human testimony to its truth. What is important here is to notice that he is not announcing something new, but recalling to the minds of the Corinthians an already firmly established tradition of the Church, which he had taught them previously, and, as he was writing some twenty-five years after the Crucifixion, a tradition which went back to within a few years of the event with which it dealt. Indeed, it is probable that "he is making reference to his interviews with the earlier Apostles on his visit to Jerusalem [*cf.* Gal. i. 18 *ff.*] which would carry back the observance a score of years behind the date at which he writes, and make those Apostles attest it within a few years of Christ's death."* That accepted tradition of the Church must, to any thoughtful person, be of immense weight. As we shall see presently, it is on this ground, rather than on any New Testament evidence, that we can with most confidence regard Holy Communion as from the first a regular institution. So far as the New Testament goes, putting aside St. Luke for the present (though new light may at any time be let in as to his evidence), seeing that St. Mark is silent, we have only St. Paul's testimony, a

* Thayer, *Journal of Bible Lit.*, vol. xviii., p. 124.

testimony which I feel pretty confident scholarship will conclude belongs rather to the interpretation of the event than to the record itself. Now it is a generally agreed canon that when various reports are available, isolated teaching should be received with caution. Therefore, we must allow that this part of St. Paul's record has less proof behind it than such details as are common to the other narratives. But does not the same argument apply *pari passu* to St. Mark's silence? We ought not to build too much on a single case of evidence of a negative character. To argue from silence is always precarious.

Two more objections to the trustworthiness of St. Paul's witness can soon be dealt with. It is perfectly true that in his teaching regarding both the Sacraments, there is a fullness and an advance which we do not find in the fragmentary utterances of our Lord, but as I hope to show later, these can well be considered to be " the unfolding of truths which the teaching of Jesus contained in the germ."* I hope also to be able to make clear that St. Paul is one of the best and truest interpreters of the mind of Jesus. With regard to St. Paul's alleged dependence upon the mystery religions, the supposed dependence has been greatly exaggerated. St. Paul gladly met the devotees of such cults on any common ground he could find, and wisely baptized into the Christian Church whatever he felt to be of value in their systems, but to the last he remained faithful to the Jewish foundations of his early life. We are bound to remind those who

* Thayer, *J.B.L.*, vol. xviii., p. 120.

make St. Paul the founder of the rite, of the way in which elsewhere he carefully distinguishes what he has "received from the Lord" from his own conclusions, and to point to the confidence with which he traces the tradition in question to Jesus, and to add that great as was his influence, it was quite inadequate for such a result as the one here suggested.

Clearly he was the representative of a common tradition, and not the author of it. To him we owe the unfolding of much of its meaning. No doubt he adapted the rite to more regular and reverent use, but unless we entirely discredit St. Paul, we must accept his assurance that in some way or other he felt able to trace back ultimately to Jesus the injunction which in 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25 he ascribes to Him, and allow that its origin is not with St. Paul, but "from the Lord."

5. We have to meet one more objection, which is that if our appeal is solely or chiefly to the New Testament, it involves a literalism which in other instances we disclaim. And we answer at once that that is just what we are not content to do; our appeal is not only to the New Testament narratives; indeed, we may even say that in this case it is not even primarily to the New Testament, but to the practice of the Church. It is clearly vain to study the Bible apart from the living Church.

Dr. Figgis says: "It is impossible to take the Bible purely apart from the society of which it was the outcome."* Obviously this is true, because "the Bible is not a revelation, but the record of a

* At Pan-Anglican Congress, 1908.

revelation."* I know no instance which better demonstrates the truth of these sayings than the one now before us. We have been earnestly seeking to read the New Testament records impartially. But a certain amount of doubt remains. Some critics who wish to be quite reasonable still question whether there is sufficient New Testament evidence to settle the matter. Let us then turn to the Church's witness, to the way the Church interpreted the matter from the beginning. It is not only that she may prove herself able to guide us rightly where we are doubtful, but that if we can be satisfied that she was actually practising the rite when she collected and issued the books which contain the story of its origin, then we can safely conclude that she interpreted the narrative in them as agreeing with her practice.

Now no one who studies the Acts of the Apostles and weighs what we find there in more than one passage about "the breaking of bread," and notices what a regular custom it had apparently become, and further recalls what has been said about St. Paul's reference to the practice as fully recognized, and as forming the basis for the teaching he gives about it, can fail to see what the Church's witness is. It is clear that the Apostolic Church regarded Holy Communion as an institution coming from Jesus Himself. It is clear that her members believed that He commenced the custom which has gone on ever since, and to provide for which all our Christian churches have been built. It is clear that that was the interpretation which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the earliest Christians put upon our

* At Pan-Anglican Congress, 1908.

Lord's words and actions in the Upper Room. It is clear that the Church was teaching this when she adopted and approved the books of the New Testament, and that if, *e.g.*, she had felt the silence of the Gospels to be a witness against her practice, she would have found herself in a great dilemma. It is clear that this was the tradition which spread from Jerusalem within a single generation without any trace of dissent through Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and was universally accepted and invested with peculiar sanctity in churches of Petrine as well as churches of Pauline origin. I know no better illustration of the proper relationship between the Church and the Bible. It is obvious that it is not here a question of doctrine but of fact, not a case of the meaning of Holy Communion but of the existence of a custom—the very existence of which testifies to the Church's belief in Jesus having instituted the blessed Sacrament of His most precious Body and Blood.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER II

Necessity of investigation. Large bibliography of subject, but few English writings. Treatment of subject in a recent popular English commentary. Dr. P. Gardner's views. Dean Rashdall's views. Dr. Glover's views. Attitude of the Friends. Does careful research strengthen or weaken a belief in an institution? Important study for Christian apologists. Method of approach. Value of tradition. New knowledge. Paramount claims of truth.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM

The problem for discussion may be stated rather more fully than in the short title selected, thus: "Can we, in the light of modern research, venture to affirm that Holy Communion was instituted by Jesus Christ?" Some may wonder at such a problem being raised; some may even question its propriety and regard it as irreverent. I recently broached the matter to a scholarly friend, a student of theology and of liturgiology, and he raised his eyebrows and said: "The origin of Holy Communion, how can there be any problem about that?" And yet there is an immense bibliography on the subject, and between 1890 and 1899 alone more than 200 articles bearing on it appeared in various reviews, and in France, Germany, and Switzerland there has been of recent years a big output of literature.* But as I am writing with the hope of helping some fellow-students of my own country, it seems right to draw attention to the scarcity of books (other than articles in periodicals or encyclopædias) in the English language. On the other hand, to show that it is being carefully considered by a growing number of scholars and leaders at

* *Cf.* Alphabetical subject index and index of *Encyclopædia to Periodical Articles in Religion*, 1890–1899, New York, 1907.

home, it only needs to direct attention to a book which appeared in 1919 and has already had a large circulation and been recommended in high quarters,* and to contrast it with the majority of New Testament commentaries which have been published before in England. I refer to Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Without attaching any special infallibility to this or any of the books to be mentioned later, the way our subject is treated in this commentary will fairly indicate what I wish to make clear as to the present trend of opinion, and as to the views which are being presented to the growing generation. Let any student consult this commentary on the matter under consideration, and he will fail to find anywhere in its pages an affirmative reply to our enquiry. In the chapter by Mr. H. G. Wood, entitled "The Life and Teaching of Jesus," we read: "The narratives in St. Matthew and St. Mark do not suggest that Jesus expressly desired the repetition of the scene in the Upper Room. It is doubtful if we ought to say that He ordained the Sacrament. But it was natural that whensoever the disciples met to break bread they should recall what Jesus did in that last night when He was betrayed. Jesus had made the sharing of bread and wine a means of life-giving remembrance of His Sacrifice" (p. 668). When we turn to the commentaries on St. Matthew and St. Mark we find no indication of any institution. In St. Luke, where the text is carefully discussed, we read: "There is no

* Clergy and students of Theology have recently been advised by a leading preacher and scholar of the Church of England to acquire and read the book.

institution of a new rite; ver. 19 f., which alone deals with this, is a subsequent insertion due to a feeling that the rite must have originated with Jesus" (p. 739). In 1 Cor. xi. 17-34 (by the editor), the only sentence which seems to imply an institution is, "Paul comments that whenever the command of repetition is fulfilled they (*i.e.*, the Corinthians) set forth as in a sacred drama the Lord's death, till He returns" (p. 842). It will be seen that I have not overstated the result of the teaching of this book. No doubt to those who are not conversant with the problem which the New Testament presents on this subject, both the silences and the statements just referred to may appear puzzling. I hope, however, shortly to be able to make things much clearer. I trust that no reader will allow the subject to be prejudged. When so little is said, as in the passages quoted, and when perhaps it is difficult to say more in the space afforded, it is a pity that the little should be seized upon either to denounce the writers themselves or to discredit the subject they speak of. This is always apt to be done by people without sufficient knowledge, but difficult things have often a way of appearing simple to those who know little about them!

It will be well here to refer shortly to a few other English scholars who even more positively question the fact of Jesus having instituted the Holy Communion.

Little need be said here of Professor Percy Gardner's attitude, as I shall have to refer to him later. On the other hand, as he was one of the earliest to challenge the traditional

view,* his name cannot here be left out altogether. His modification of his once extreme position will be explained presently, but he still holds to his main contention, that Jesus did not institute any rite, but that it arose early in the Church.

Dean Rashdall, in a note on the Last Supper,† speaking of the words "This do in remembrance of Me," says that they may certainly be regarded as a later addition, and continues, "If we set these words aside, there is nothing to suggest that our Lord had the intention of founding an institution or permanent rite of any kind." Dr. Glover says: "There is a growing consensus of opinion among independent scholars that Jesus instituted no Sacraments. Yet Paul found the rudiments of them among the Christians, and believed he had the warrant of Jesus for the heightening which he gave to them."‡ Dr. W. Morgan says: "There are strong reasons for believing that Jesus did not contemplate the founding of a rite that should survive His death."§ The attitude taken by the English Quakers is well known, though it may be well to quote from Robert Barclay's *Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, written in 1675, and setting forth Quaker principles in moderate terms and with considerable learning. Examining the records in the Gospels and in 1 Cor., he concludes that Christ never intended to found an institution such as the

* *Cf. The Origin of the Lord's Supper* and *Exploratio Evangelica.*

† Bampton Lectures, *The Idea of Atonement*, chap. i., see p. 59.

‡ Quoted from *The Times Literary Supplement*, April 22, 1920.

§ Dr. Morgan, *Religion and Theology of St. Paul*, chapter "Church and Sacrament."

Eucharist. He accepted as authentic the words "Do this in remembrance of Me," though he notices that they are only to be found in St. Luke and St. Paul, but he says that the expression "will amount to no more than this: that being the last time that Christ did eat with His disciples, He desired them that in their eating and drinking they might have regard to Him, and by the remembering of that opportunity be the more stirred up to follow Him through sufferings and death." Luther also is claimed as being doubtful about the obligation of the rite, for in accusing Rome of tyranny in withholding the cup from the laity, he says: "Not that they sin against Christ who use one kind only, since Christ has not commanded the use of any, but has left it to the choice of each individual, saying, 'This do ye, as oft as ye shall do it, in remembrance of Me.'"*

I think, then, that it will be admitted that in the opinion of a growing number of scholars the question is an open one. If I did not hope that I should be able to contribute something constructive and not destructive, to reassure rather than to alarm, I should not venture to write.

This is a subject which is now often raised, and it is of great importance that Christian apologists should be able to give a sound and reasoned reply. Only, of course, if our enquiry is to be of any value, we must first of all approach it from the historical standpoint, and we must not have any prior theory into which facts are to be fitted, but having first discovered the facts, we must then proceed to build

* Wace and Buchheim's *Luther's Primary Works*, p. 309; and *cf.* Hoffman, *Die Abendmahlgedanken Jesu Christ*, p. 99.

a theory, and in the process we must always be careful—not, indeed, to understate arguments which apparently support our own view, for "that which is less than the truth is as untrue as that which is contrary to it," but to avoid overstating them. It is not partial truth which we are out to seek, but truth itself, so far as we can discover it, whole and perfect. Harnack, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* of June 14, 1890, said of Bishop Lightfoot: "There never has been an apologist who was less of an advocate than Lightfoot. . . . He has never defended a tradition for the tradition's sake."* That should be our aim also. Again, many writers seem contented merely to restate tradition, yet no dogmatic reassertions of tradition can alter the progress of enquiry, and they will only convince those already convinced. Tradition, of course, may and will count for much, but tradition must have solid facts as a background. Christianity naturally comes, and in the first instance can only come by tradition. On tradition the Church of Christ stands, but if in any direction it is possible to prove the tradition false, either altogether or in some point vital to its structure, then the Church only stands to fall. And we must remember that "knowledge constantly grows, and in its growth it perpetually challenges this tradition to vindicate itself. Moreover, under the influence of the persistent and constantly changing challenge, the tradition submits to modification, so that while it is continuous, it is not unchanging. The result is that in

* Quoted by Hort in his article on J. B. Lightfoot in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*

every age new questions arise, concerning first the truth of the tradition as a whole; secondly, the modifications in it that are called for by new knowledge; and thirdly, the extent to which (if at all) these modifications discredit the tradition itself."* Those are wise words, and we commend them to those who shut their eyes to the discoveries of modern scholarship. The same writer goes on to say " the claim of truth is paramount; there is no dispute about that, the dispute is concerning the kind of evidence that is admissible, or the weight that may rightly be attached to the various kinds."* Our task, therefore, is to search out the documentary evidence and to find out its exact bearing on the problem. Is there more to be said in this discussion on the positive or on the negative side? Are there any other considerations, religious or historical or psychological, which ought to weigh with us, and if so, with how much weight? Do any antecedent probabilities suggest an affirmative or a negative reply? When all this has been impartially considered, we must be prepared to accept the conclusions to which our research has brought us. One satisfaction which such a search may bring will be to make us feel that the truth that we have reached on this very important subject will be our truth, and not merely the tradition of other thinkers and of other ages. We may also rest confident that in the long run any error mixed up with our setting out of the truth will be corrected, and only what is genuinely true will remain.

* Bp. W. Temple, " Truth and Tradition," *The Pilgrim*, October, 1921.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF APPROACH TO PROBLEM

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER III

Objections to the problem being raised, on the ground of sufficiency of tradition. Various layers of tradition in New Testament's four narratives of the event. Need to disentangle these. Distinguishing facts from interpretation of facts. Influence of event on the writers and on their reports. Contribution of Fourth Gospel. Historical method of approach and what it involves. Ways of testing reports. A backward and forward look. Interpretation as an element. Its place in inspiration. Subjectivity. Factors in the writing of history. Limits to our enquiry and to result hoped for.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF APPROACH TO PROBLEM

BEARING in mind what we have said about tradition, we must be prepared to be met with some such reply as the following: "We are entirely satisfied with the tradition of Holy Communion which we have received; it is drawn from the Gospels and St. Paul, and it has been carefully safeguarded by the Church. We are confident that we can trace it back to the various New Testament accounts of the Lord's Supper, and feeling safe there, we see no reason why anyone should attempt to disturb our faith." This is a very natural position, and were it not that the tradition is already very emphatically questioned (as we have already seen*) it might suffice. But, as has been pointed out already, new knowledge perpetually challenges tradition to vindicate itself, and the last fifty years of New Testament research have let in an extraordinary amount of new light upon New Testament origins. Moreover, we are reminded by this attitude of some in our Lord's time, who were quite unwilling to receive the new light that He was trying to shed on the Old Testament, exclaiming "The old is good," and we recall that while He made every allowance for

* *Cf.* also Chap. XI., pp. 194 and 195.

their position, yet He did not cease to provide "new wine" for those who had courage to taste it.

Those who thus prefer to fall back upon tradition, which they profess to trace to the New Testament, overlook the fact that within the New Testament there are earlier and later layers of tradition, and that it is only by scholarly research that we can solve the problems raised by this apparent want of agreement and can ascertain which gives the most primitive and the most reliable account of what actually took place on "the night in which He was betrayed."

In the New Testament there are at least four accounts of the origin of Holy Communion—viz., those given by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul. They do not agree in every detail. Which is the earliest? Which gives us the truest idea of what was in the mind of Jesus, when He first took bread and broke it, and blessed wine and bade His disciples drink of it? In the four accounts of which we have spoken there are at least three (probably more) different traditions: (*a*) There is the Marcan tradition (St. Mark xiv. 22-25), and with small variations this is repeated by St. Matthew. (*b*) There is the Lucan one as seen in our Revised Version (St. Luke xxii. 14-20), and *cf.* marginal note on verses 19 and 20. It is significant that such learned scholars as Westcott and Hort (whom no one will accuse of destructive criticism) find here two or more traditions of different date, which have to be distinguished* (see Appendix to Chapter VII.).

* Their conclusion, now largely accepted, was that at an early date some further words were inserted in St. Luke to bring the account into closer harmony with the corresponding narratives.

(*c*) There is the Pauline one, with additions, which, if they form part of the original tradition, make us ask why St. Mark (if his tradition is the earliest) leaves out what is so important a part of the story. In all these ways readers who have not had much theological teaching need guidance from those who have carefully studied the subject, and who can, therefore, help them to unravel the different strands of tradition, and show them how to reconcile real or apparent difficulties, and so to harmonize the accounts. In doing this, we must start with facts, and carefully distinguish between facts and the interpretation of facts. Broadly speaking, we shall find the facts in the Synoptists, and both the facts and the interpretation of them in St. Paul and in the Fourth Gospel. We must first determine what the Supper was at which Jesus broke bread with His disciples, and allow for any light which that throws upon the problem. Then we must see whether, besides settling the outward surroundings of the scene, we can discover what importance the occasion had, first, for Jesus Himself, and then for the different authors, and what place it occupied in their life and thought. Then we must try to trace the observance in New Testament times, in the Acts and Epistles, and must note the undoubted evolution of the teaching about it, as revealed in St. Paul, who adds to the facts his own explanation of them. Moreover, though the Fourth Gospel does not give the story of the Eucharist, yet it not only seems to postulate it, but it contributes quite an appreciable amount of teaching as to the meaning underlying it, and the proper interpretation of it. We shall

not attempt to trace the development further, though scholars will bear in mind that a somewhat rapid evolution followed in the Apostolic Fathers, and can be traced through Clement of Rome, Ignatius, the Didache* and Justin Martyr, whose narrative we may describe as the limit of the process, so far as our main subject (the institution) is concerned. The idea of an institution lies in the very centre of Justin's account, and dominates henceforth the development of Eucharistic ideas.†

In this search we shall start with the only satisfactory method—viz., the historical. It will be well to banish at first all preconceptions, dogmatic or otherwise. Dogmatic conceptions, results of religious experience, *a priori* expectations,‡ traditional views, may later bring valuable assistance, and will all have their necessary share in helping each individual towards the appropriation of the facts and of their meaning ; but in determining the

* The date of this is uncertain. *Cf.* Dean A. Robinson's *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*, though other recent writers hold different views to those which the Dean there expresses.

† This is well illustrated by comparing two of the most interesting and scholarly of the recent French works on the subject, one written from the liberal and subjective, the other from the traditional, point of view—viz., Goguel's *l'Eucharistie, des origines à Justin Martyr*, 1909, and P. Batiffol's *Études d'Histoire, Second Series, l'Eucharistie*, seventh edition, 1920. The former starts with the New Testament, and ends with Justin Martyr; the latter starts with Justin Martyr, and works backward to the New Testament. Goguel gives as a reason for limiting his study thus, that Justin Martyr is "*la terme d'une évolution*," and his conception contains all the elements which develop later, p. 32.

‡ In the chapter on "Eschatology" and "Institutionalism," which deals with *a priori* objections to the fact of an institution, we shall apply the same historical test.

facts they are not applicable, being largely the result of the particular religious traditions of a man's past life, and often contributing nothing beyond the reassuring echo of his own dogmatic prejudices. The historical method involves an attempt to trace the different steps traversed, and to note the general process of thought concerning the Eucharist during the period under consideration. It endeavours to put the history of the Eucharist in its proper perspective, with its background carefully filled in, and its various steps of forward evolution marked. It searches for any differing or opposing views of writers, which, by the mutual clash of arguments, may help to bring out the truths most fitted to survive; and to a large extent the New Testament is a record of truths reached through controversy and diverging views. It welcomes any help from language, art, archæology or philosophy, all of which contribute towards resetting the early Christian records in their original environment. It takes into account the background of Rabbinism and of the mystery cults of the Roman Empire, as well as the strains of Orientalism and of popular pagan religions. It insists that no scene or incident can be viewed alone, as all belong to history, each having its own source, and each leading on to further developments. Thus it regards all as forming a long historical sequence, stretching back not only into Judaism and Hellenism, but greatly influenced by the period between the two Testaments. It also recalls how, looking forward, the subsequent history of Christianity has had its reflex influence on the New

Testament, and has influenced not only its text and contents, but has determined the way it is read and interpreted. In fact, it seeks on every side anything which can help to explain the evolution of the Eucharist, and does not decline in advance any attempt at a solution of the problem.

It further asks how much of the element of interpretation can be found in the New Testament itself, and how far the historians have allowed any partisan bias, or love of effect, or desire to preach, to influence their presentations of the past. It goes without saying that the task of determining these things is one of immense difficulty, particularly because there is rarely any court of appeal outside the New Testament authorities by which the latter can be tested. Still, remembering how ancient writers—*e.g.*, Thucydides, Livy, Tacitus,* etc.—wrote with a definite purpose, deliberately colouring their facts to produce certain effects, and seeing that such was the accepted rule of the period we are considering, we have to attempt to check the New Testament authors also, and to ask whether this element enters into their books as well. The element of interpretation is in no way a denial of inspiration, but only one of its methods of working, and while we may feel a natural shrinking from the subjective element, it must be

* We do not imply that Thucydides and Tacitus are on quite the same level, though the methods of both illustrate our contention. The former is far more of an objective historian than the latter, who writes with the definite object of glorifying, whether right or wrong, the old Republic. We need not look further than our war literature, both during and since the War, for glaring illustrations of a like method.

remembered that subjectivity is not necessarily unreal or deceptive, but only the personality of the writer impressing itself upon his records and putting his meaning into his facts. In all history, whether ancient or modern, there is a didactic element. History is not merely selection of facts, but a grouping of them and a colour given to them. It is evident that this is to be found in the four Evangelists, and that it often accounts for the different presentations in them of the same event.*

We do not ask a historian to be a mere chronicler, or simply a means of registering certain actions; we may fairly allow him to reveal through them something of his own outlook and of his own philosophy of life. If, then, we pursue this method, we must be ready to allow for all these elements, and to weigh all such carefully without any prejudice, and "to honour our faith too highly to make any sacrifice of truth at its altars. . . .

"We may discover that some sections of the primitive historical tradition are really more or less partial embodiments of religious convictions which sprang from the Christian experience. The historical method has, in all fairness, to allow for the possibility of the formulated belief reacting upon the

* Illustrations might be given from any of the Gospels, but it may suffice to quote the following words from Dr. Streeter's *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, *cf.* pp. 210-227: "Luke is a consummate literary artist. He is writing a biography avowedly inspired, like a biography by a Tacitus or a Plutarch, with that feeling of *pietas* towards its subject which antiquity praised in an historian, but which modern scholars will with difficulty condone. The artist starts with a definite conception of that which he is to depict; he selects, he arranges, above all he ruthlessly discards."

materials of the experience—*i.e.*, upon the reasons which it imagined it possessed. . . . "There is also the possibility with which research must frankly reckon, that the Evangelists were tempted to read back into the life of Jesus their later convictions."*

It does not at all follow that the method here advocated will in this or any other problem supply us with a complete solution. There is no doubt that the determination of the relation between the historic Supper in the Upper Chamber and the Church's Eucharist is a problem of great delicacy, and it may well be that here, as in various other New Testament traditions, we may find that the materials to hand do not furnish sufficient criteria for choosing decidedly between two or more possible explanations, and that at the end we have to leave such as open questions.

* *Cf.* Moffatt, *The Approach to the New Testament* (especially pp. 165, 166), to which I wish to express my great indebtedness. The whole subject is there worked out very thoroughly, and the objections to and the limitations of the historical method are set forth. I have ventured to apply to the particular subject under consideration principles so ably set forth in this helpful book. Goguel also passes in review various methods of approach to the subject, and shows the superiority of the historical method (*cf. l'Eucharistie*, chap. ii. "La Méthode"). It does not seem necessary to add any further bibliography for this chapter than books already referred to.

CHAPTER IV

A PRIORI OBJECTIONS

ESCHATOLOGY—INSTITUTIONALISM

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER IV

Do considerations of the attitude of Jesus to Eschatology and Institutionalism weaken or strengthen the probability of an institution? Our knowledge of the mind of Jesus. (1) *Eschatology*. Difficulty of subject. Sketch of various explanations offered by scholars. None of these incompatible with institution. Jesus transmutes Jewish Apocalyptism. His message prophetic. Passages which transcend current views. St. Paul's eschatology very marked. Yet combines belief in institution. (2) *Institutionalism*. Was Jesus anti-institutionalist? Did He institute anything? The Lord's Prayer. Did Jesus found a Church? The Jewish and the Christian Church. Their relations. Their chief characteristics. Evolution of Church. Harnack's and Loisy's views. The Gospels and Acts. The Church from above and from below. Jesus did not provide any form of organization. The Holy Spirit's guidance. Jesus foresaw and planned Church. Church requires conception in mind of its Founder. Attitude of Jesus towards institutionalism quite consistent with current Church belief about Holy Communion. Notes on Bishop Headlam's *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*, and on Du Bose's views on Institutionalism.

CHAPTER IV

A PRIORI OBJECTIONS

Eschatology

It is not necessary for us to go very fully into the difficult problems of eschatology and institutionalism. We are concerned with them only so far as they bear on the question before us, and for reasons which will appear shortly, they had better be taken in the order indicated. For if the views propounded by Schweitzer are accepted in their entirety, *cadit quæstio*. On the other hand, if it can be shown that they do not shake the contention of the Church that Jesus instituted a memorial of Himself, our case is proportionately strengthened. Eschatology and to a certain extent institutionalism also, are recent subjects of study, and scholars hold different opinions about them. The former especially is very modern, and may still very widely be regarded as an open subject. It is therefore only possible for us to investigate in general terms, whether our Lord's attitude to either suggests a positive or a negative answer to our enquiry. If it be felt that the documentary evidence for Jesus having instituted Holy Communion is not in itself decisive, if there are some whom the tradition and custom of the Church does not convince, does the attitude of Jesus to either of these subjects contribute any element of decision? For I think we may humbly,

yet thankfully, say that we have ample ground for alleging that the reliability of our Gospel records is sufficiently established* to warrant our feeling that we know the mind of Christ and can hardly fail to recognize what He regarded as primary in the new faith.†

Is there, then, anything in His general attitude which makes it improbable that He would bequeath to His Church the Memorial which it traces back to Him?

There is much difference of opinion as to the amount of eschatological teaching which can be clearly traced to Jesus Himself. No scholar denies the strong eschatological expectations of His period, or the belief that the Parousia of the Messiah was imminent. If this, as many hold, was also the belief of Jesus Himself, it would seem at first sight to follow that He could not have instituted a rite which appears to anticipate a future of a very different character. Many opponents of Christian institutions will confidently prophesy that our ship is bound to founder upon this rock. We accept the challenge the more gladly, as we feel safe in any ship in which we believe that Jesus and the institution

* We have impressive vindications of the historical trustworthiness of the Gospels as a whole in two recent volumes—viz., Bishop Headlam's *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*, pp. 1-44, and Dr. Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Documents*. *Cf.* also Dr. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission;* Dean J. A. Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels;* Dr. Moffatt, *The Historical New Testament;* Professor Nairne, *The Faith of the New Testament;* Sir W. Ramsay, *Bearings of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament.*

† *Cf.* Moffatt, *The Approach to the Gospels*, p. 192.

of the Holy Communion are voyaging together. We have said that we are not called upon to go over the whole of the wide expanse covered by " the real and baffling problem of eschatology."* Every student who keeps in touch with modern intellectual developments knows that there lie embedded in the Gospels, as coming from the lips of Jesus, passages anticipating a speedy crisis, in which result subsequent history has apparently not borne Him out. During the last twenty years, especially since Schweitzer put forth his " too rigidly eschatological theory,"† various theories have been propounded. The first step in the problem is to determine whether these utterances we are considering, and the views which they express, belong really to Jesus or only to His reporters.

1. Many scholars feel constrained to ascribe them to Jesus, and even to " be prepared to think Jesus mistaken as to the mode of His inauguration of His Kingdom,"‡ regarding this as part of the condition of the reality of His Incarnation and of the limitations of His Kenosis. They hold that to Him, as was usual in prophetic circles, the future was foreshortened, and that here, as on some other subjects, Jesus Himself, as well as His disciples, shared the limited horizon of His contemporaries.§ It seems difficult to do proper justice to the records without admitting that Jesus on occasions did, like

* Moffatt, *The Theology of the Gospels*, p. 42.

† Moffatt, *idem*, and *cf.* Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.*

‡ *Cf.* W. Temple, *The Faith and Modern Thought.*

§ *Cf.* Von Dobschütz, *The Eschatology of the Gospels.*

other prophets, foreshorten the time. There is also the suggestion that Jesus Himself changed His mind on the question whether the end would be catastrophic or evolutionary at some point of His ministry.

2. Others prefer to interpret such utterances not literally but figuratively and symbolically; and there is no doubt that sufficient allowance has not always been made for this element, and that attention to it and to the context will often cause the difficulty to disappear.

3. Others, again, think that Jesus was constrained to accommodate Himself to the limited ability of His hearers to understand His words, and that, although He Himself was under no kind of delusion, what He said was believed to be capable only of this particular interpretation. With all seers the spiritual and intellectual poise of a man's hearers, and their ability to receive and assimilate His teachings, are factors to be reckoned with. In this case, Jesus is not to be measured even by His best reporters, since the report was influenced by the ideas current in the body of Christian believers by whom and for whom the Gospels were drawn up.*

4. Yet others turn with confidence to the Fourth Gospel and conclude that the spiritual conceptions found there, to the understanding of which the Spirit of Jesus had by that time led the Church,†

* Gore, *Belief in Christ.* "There was mistake, but it was on the part of the disciples, and not of our Lord" (p. 154, and *cf.* pp. 149-154). On p. 147 he says: "St. Matthew tends to heighten the apocalyptic colouring of our Lord's discourses." We recall Matthew Arnold's canon of interpretation that "Jesus is above His reporters," and if a misconception has intruded into the record, it is theirs and not His.

† *Cf.* Moffatt, pp. 42-46.

embody the larger truths which lie beneath the apocalyptic utterances recorded in the Synoptists. In such dark sayings the secret of the Lord is with them that love Him, and this is a marked characteristic of the Fourth Gospel.

5. Lastly, many fall back on the reflection that where reports differ we cannot feel that we have the actual words spoken by our Lord.*

Practically all the scholars whose views are even partially reflected above, agree that Jesus, so far as He used the language of apocalypse, was always transforming its ideas,† that He profoundly modified contemporary apocalyptic views connecting men's ideas of the Kingdom with His own more spiritual conceptions of God, and that this was the starting-point for the development which culminated in the Fourth Gospel. The stress laid upon the inward and present, as opposed to the outward and future, thus began not with the Church but with Jesus. What Jewish eschatology relegated to the last days, Jesus regarded as already at hand, and what it pictured as external, He saw as internal.

We have endeavoured very briefly to make our readers understand something of one of the most puzzling Christological problems. It does not

* "Where the reports differ in detail, one thing is certain, we cannot be sure of the words of Christ on the particular occasion" (Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 144).

† "So often in the teaching of Jesus, the borrowed idea received so many new values . . . that it is hard to dissociate it from them, and to realize how much more is done for it by the borrower than by the originators" (Glover, *Progress in Religion*, p. 318). Von Dobschütz speaks often of the "transmuted eschatology of Jesus" (*The Eschatology of the Gospels*).

belong to our task to investigate the matter further. Only we feel that in the variety of the proposed solutions there lies a real reply to those critics who would call a pause at the outset and say that our enquiry is blocked by the matter under discussion. On the one hand, it is clear that no one of the five solutions is really incompatible with an institution; and on the other hand, when there is so much uncertainty and difference of opinion, few would care to dogmatize or to say that the case against such a step is foreclosed.* At the same time we can go a long way further in the positive direction, and adduce two very satisfactory considerations which set free our immediate enquiry from difficulty.

1. In the first place, it will be clear to any careful student that the mind of Jesus was much larger than the apocalyptic theory will allow. The content of His teaching is by no means exhausted by the eschatological element. Into it are woven many strands of varied colour.† Side by side with the apocalyptic strains, and in several places quite independently of them, are distinct expectations of a future for His Church on earth. And we may add that the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus is both small and subsidiary, and in its extreme form has but little support in our texts. The real message of Jesus is prophetic, and can easily be detached from apocalyptic ideas. It is quite clear not only that there are abundant strata in Q, and so also in a lesser degree in

* Glover says: "It is more than possible that the significance of Apocalyptic is being exaggerated" (*Progress in Religion*, *p.* 311).

† *Cf.* Headlam, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-169.

St. Mark,* which do not rest upon the eschatological expectations, but also that we find parables and sayings which describe a gradual spiritual process which is to work in the Church of the future. Even such passages as St. Mark ix. 1, xiv. 25, St. Luke xxii. 29 *f.*, which are usually quoted as purely apocalyptic, are quite reasonably explained in accordance with the evolutionary spiritual outlook which Jesus often displays. Again, in St. Mark xiii. 1-13, there is a well authenticated discourse in which Jesus deprecates the idea of the nearness of the end, warns against false prophets, pictures the disciples as a company sufficiently visible to be persecuted, declares that the Gospel has to be preached throughout the world, and promises salvation only to those who endure to the end.† Further instances of a similar nature will be given when we deal with institutionalism. It will suffice here to urge that in interpreting the sayings of Jesus room must be found for both these elements—viz., the insistence on the end as at hand, and on the present as likely to continue, or, to use Baron von Hügel's words, on " a gradual, prophetic, immanental, predominantly ethical element, and a sudden, apocalyptic, transcendental, purely religious element."‡ Therefore, a higher

* *Cf.* St. Mark x. 30-32, xii. 1-12, xiii. 10-14 *ff.*; and St. Luke xxi. 20-24.

† Other reasons will be found in M. Jones's *New Testament in Twentieth Century*, pp. 103-111, and for fuller treatment than is here possible *cf.* Headlam, *op. cit.*, especially the chapter on the " Kingdom of God," pp. 262-266.

‡ Baron von Hügel in *Eternal Life*. There is no vital contradiction between evolutionary movement, and catastrophe. To which ought the Great War to be traced ?

synthesis must be sought which sacrifices neither. It will, however, be clear that there is enough of this strain of teaching which we have called prophetic to support such an act as the institution of the Eucharist, to last till Jesus should come again.*

2. The second consideration attaches to St. Paul and is the more striking because of his pronounced apocalyptic views.† How near St. Paul believed the end to be, when he wrote his earliest epistles, is well known, and though he gradually modified this view, yet he evidently never found it incompatible with the tradition which shortly after his conversion he had received about the Lord's Supper and which he instructed his converts to continue "till He come."

Therefore, to him the reconciling of the two proved no difficulty. So, in the case both of the Master and of His chief Apostle,‡ the time of the

* To say that Jesus could not have instituted Holy Communion, because He looked for a speedy realization of the Kingdom, runs counter to His acceptance of the "servant of the Lord" destiny in Isa. xlii., lii., lxii., with its promise of spiritual inheritance among the Gentiles in return for faithful service unto death. *Cf.* St. Mark i. 11, ix. 12, x. 45; St. Matt. xii. 18; St. Luke iv. 16-21.

† "The eschatological was more visible in Paul than in Jesus" (Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 212). Dean Inge in *Outspoken Essays*, vol. i., in chap. "St. Paul," speaks of "St. Paul's development from the naïve picture of the Messiah in Thessalonians coming in clouds through the Christology of the central group, where the eschatology is seriously modified, and the Parousia becomes the end of the existing world order." *Cf.* also Nairne, *The Faith of the New Testament*, p. 92 *f.*

‡ *Cf. Camb. Biblical Essays*, "Jesus and Paul," p. 365, by Prof. C. A. A. Scott, who illustrates the striking harmony between Jesus and Paul, with respect to their teaching on eschatology, and shows that "the same contrast, which is asserted to be irreconcileable in Jesus, presents itself in Paul." Yet the latter reconciles it with the institution tradition he proclaims.

coming is clearly uncertain, and there is room, be the period long or short, for the use of this Memorial. Indeed, it may be regarded as intended to bridge the gulf (this seems to be suggested by St. Paul's "till He come") and as Christ's own tender *au revoir*, and His most considerate *rendez-vous*, at which His disciples may meet Him and may hold communion with Him until He return to consummate their union, and to drink new wine with them in the Kingdom of God.

LITERATURE FOR ESCHATOLOGY

SCHÜRER: *History of the Jewish People.* 1885. E.T.

R. H. CHARLES: *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian,* 1900; and various works, 1893–1912. (Dr. Charles's editions of various apocalyptic books are immensely helpful. A valuable popular account of the ideas in which Jesus and the Apostles grew up, will be found in his *Between the Old and New Testaments*, Home Univ. Library.)

BOUSSET: *Die Religion des Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* 1902.

SCHWEITZER: *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.* 1910. E.T.

VON DOBSCHÜTZ: *The Eschatology of the Gospels.* 1910.

C. W. EMMET: *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels.* 1910.

E. F. SCOTT: *The Kingdom and the Messiah.* 1910.

Foundations, by Seven Oxford Tutors. 1912.

E. C. DEWICK: *Primitive Eschatology.* 1912.

Articles on "Eschatology," *H.D.B.*, *Ency. Bibl.*, and *Dict. of Relig. and Ethics.*

MONTEFIORE: *The Old Testament and After.* 1923.

Jesus and Institutionalism

It is often said that Jesus was no institutionalist, and that it is inherently improbable that He would institute Sacraments, and that "if He commanded Baptism as an outward act, if He instituted Holy Communion as a formal service to be repeated simply because He willed it, if He made participation in these rites a condition of discipleship, then He is inconsistent with the Gospel portrait as a whole." There is much exaggeration in such language which we could challenge, but we had better consider the question on its own merits. The writer recalls how a few years ago, when discussing our present problem with a Cambridge Professor of Divinity, he asked the Professor whether, putting aside for the sake of argument the actual rite of Holy Communion, it would be true to say that there was nothing of which we could affirm quite absolutely that "Jesus instituted this." His reply was, "What about the Lord's Prayer?" May we not say that if Jesus, in response to His disciples' request, gave them the formula of the Lord's Prayer, He might equally well bestow upon His Church this Sacrament which the Church traces back to Him? The writer also recalls a similar conversation with another Divinity Professor, this time a Scotch Presbyterian, and his remarking, "After all, it is only a question of one rite, and that would not constitute Jesus an institutionalist." On such general grounds as these I believe it would be difficult for an impartial judge to rule out our present enquiry. The common argument in this direction begins by trying to

demonstrate that Jesus did not really found the Christian Church, but that it developed gradually out of the Jewish Church. This is so evident that those who use it to establish such a theory as would undermine other institutional intentions, overlook the logical result of the argument. It necessarily involves the conclusion that Jesus Himself belonged to an institutional Church and deliberately allowed His Church to be built upon it as a foundation.* Moreover, His attitude towards the institutionalism of Israel was one of conformity. He acknowledged it and made use of it, while criticizing its defects and predicting its end. But He never intimated that the principle of institutionalism itself should end. Seeing, then, that Jesus remained a conforming even though a reforming member of the Jewish Church, it can hardly be asserted that He was the enemy of institutionalism. It is evident that the Christian Church was at first in the most intimate relations with the religious institutions of the Jewish people. The earliest converts to Christianity were practically "a guild of Judaism," the distinctive mark being not the neglect of Jewish ordinances, but the adherence to new duties and privileges (*cf.* Acts ii. 42). They did not forsake the Temple worship, though they added the "breaking of bread" at

* It is better not to rely in this discussion too much on the First Gospel, which in places is thought to be coloured or modified by later traditional amplifications and even by ideas of later Church organization, but however enigmatic the saying of St. Matthew xvi. 18, "On this rock I will build my Church," it witnesses to a great truth, for Christ was clearly building a Church, and building it on Jewish foundations, represented by those to whom the words were spoken.

home. It was not till later, when new needs arose, that the wine burst the skins, and a Christian Church with new characteristics came into being. This, of course, was inevitable, and is in accordance with God's universal law of growth, but it shows how truly Jesus came not "to destroy, but to fulfil." There is a real unity and continuity of corporate Church life all through the Bible. The Jewish and Christian Churches are one, and no New Testament writer thinks of separating them.* The New Testament implies an Old Testament, the new Covenant an old Covenant. Christianity was no new religion, but a renovated form of Israel's faith. God's covenant is one, and stretches over both dispensations. In the Old Testament the chief characteristic is "holy law," in the New Testament "a holy Person." The former naturally stiffened, and becoming more and more a religion *sub specie Legis*, was incapable of expansion. The latter, ranging itself *sub specie Christi*, was capable of infinite development. But there was no historical break, only a progressive revelation, and there was no call for Jesus to found a new Church, as the Church already existed.† "The idea of historical sequence, which linked Christianity to the past history of Israel, implied a decisive and final expression of the divine will for the Christian Church."‡ Thus Christianity,

* Dean of Wells, *Ency. Bibl.*, art. "Church."

† *Cf.* Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet's "The Religious Background of the New Testament Writings," in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, pp. 636-644, for fuller explanation of the views expressed above.

‡ See Moffatt, *Approach to New Testament*, p. 68

starting from Judaism,* was enabled to adopt various elements as axiomatic (and may we not put a reasonable institutionalism among these?), baptizing them and sealing them afresh with the Holy Ghost, while, under the inspiration of the same spirit of revelation, and in accordance with God's law of gradual progress, it could introduce other elements with striking originality. But all this is not contrary to, but in favour of, the principle of institutionalism. Moreover, as the Old Testament and the New Testament Church are historically one, so the New Testament itself ought never to be separated from, or spoken of as in contrast to, the Christian Church. There is no historical break between the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles. The view of the Church usually connected with the name of Loisy, of course, upholds our contention, but even if we adopt the Harnack view,† Harnack himself

* It is beyond our scope to discuss the kind of Judaism out of which Christianity emerged, but of course many changes had taken place since the Old Testament canon was closed. Further information is obtainable in the writings of Schürer, Montefiore, Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, or in various Encyclopædias. *Cf.* the recently published *The Old Testament and After*, by Montefiore.

† Harnack and Loisy may for convenience' sake be taken to illustrate the Liberal Protestant and the Modernist Catholic views of the Church, while for real Radicalism, we should turn to Kalthoff and Pfleiderer. Harnack's views will be found in *What is Christianity?* Loisy says: "The most important thing that Jesus did was to found a Church." But neither of these writers is very constant in his views. This is well known to readers of Harnack, and may be seen by comparing Loisy's *L'Évangile et L'Église*, with the same writer's recent pamphlet *Guerre et Religion*, written since his expulsion from the Roman Catholic Church.

asks why the Acts, plainly written, as it is, to form a sequel to the Gospel, was not regarded by its author as an anticlimax to the life of Christ. Evidently St. Luke regards it as a continuation of his Gospel story. So we may say that the view of the Church revealed in the Acts, is what the Evangelists believed they learnt from their Master, interpreted and illuminated by the Holy Spirit. It is obviously a one-sided exegesis of the New Testament, which would try to explain its contents and meaning only from the early stages of its story, omitting all to which these subsequently led. If God be a God of order, if the Bible be the record of His progressive and continuous revelation, if Christ went on working after His Ascension through the Holy Spirit, we are bound to link on the life and thought of the earlier chapters of the Church, whether in the Old Testament or in the Gospels, with the more abounding life and thought of the later chapters in the Acts and Epistles and subsequent ages. While we read the sayings of Jesus or interpret His parables or actions in the light of the Old Testament Church, of which He was a member, they also adumbrate His hopes and intentions for the Church He is evidently forming, and which will grow to greater things after His departure. Hence, the very fact of the rise and spread of the Christian Church after the Ascension and after the advent of the promised Comforter is a revelation of the mind of Jesus. So while some may deem it inaccurate to speak of Jesus founding a Church, it is a still greater inaccuracy to describe Him as an anti-institutionalist. He was, of course, far more concerned with great principles than with

any special form of institutionalism, but His aim was to infuse the former into the latter rather than to abolish the latter altogether. Much which He taught was so revolutionary, and so subversive of what had grown up around the Judaism of His day, that it was bound to alter eventually its whole framework, but the change took place rather by a gradual development from within than by any deliberate destruction from without.*

It was against this law of progress that His chief opponents in the Gospels, and the Judaizers afterwards, strove. But among the "quiet in the land" a new development of the Kingdom arose, which was rather a new stage of historical growth than something entirely new. By this the old form of covenant with a chosen people passed over into the new, and thus became a fulfilment rather than a destruc-

* In *The Modern Churchman*, September-October, 1917, Dean Inge says: "The earthly Christ never attempted to form a schism in the Jewish Church, still less—the very idea is absurd—claimed to substitute for it a new institutional religion." Elsewhere he says: "We may admit that Christ made no provision for a Church such as actually grew out of the little society of His followers. Those followers lived so much in the expectation of a Messianic millennium that they would not have paid much attention to such teaching, if it had been given. But the Gospel was from the first founded on brotherly love, and it is not possible for a band of brothers to be individuals in their religion, while they are closely united in all else. As soon as the Church began to be it took the form which was already familiar to the Græco-Roman world in the mysteries, that of a community of initiated persons, joined together in the worship of one Deity, with whom they maintained a mystical bond of union, through sacramental ceremonies shared in common. . . . The mystical union between Christ and His Church, and the bond of union among Church men and women, became felt realities to the devout communicant" (W. R. Inge, *Lay Views*, p. 29).

tion. On all these grounds, as well as on others which follow, we may say that Jesus accepted and adopted the idea of a Church, implied and intended a Church to carry on His work, to be the means, the chief instrument in spreading the Kingdom which He came to proclaim. Hence it would be a far more incomplete statement to speak of the Church as of human origin than to say it was founded by Jesus. The Apostles did not create it, though they certainly felt the need of it for the sake of fellowship, for mutual support and encouragement, for the spreading of the Gospel. But they did not create it. It was born from above, though it was allowed also to grow up from below. Jesus deliberately prepared the way for it, and on the day of Pentecost it arose by a creative act of the Holy Spirit. So its origin as well as its constant inspiration was from above. This by no means implies that Jesus created any particular form of organization. His attitude towards the Church of His day was one of reverence yet of discrimination, of distinguishing between the inward and the outward, between the spirit and the letter, between the kernel and the husk, between substance and form. His own emphasis was always on the spiritual and invisible, rather than on the outward and visible, on religious motive rather than on religious observance. Yet that He foresaw and felt the necessity of the other aspects as well, is clear from such parables as the Mustard Seed, the Leaven and the Tares, and while the Kingdom and the Church are not identical, yet the latter is the most distinct outward manifestation of the former. To dispute this is very seriously

to narrow the ideals of Jesus and to deny His insight into the future. It involves ultimately crediting Him with less prescience than that which has quite obviously been the property of other and lesser leaders of men. It is difficult to read the Gospels impartially without feeling that Jesus foresaw all this and was deliberately preparing for it.* Anyone who studies the gradual steps which Jesus took in His dealings with the Twelve must be impressed with this. It was a gradual but conscious forming of a visible Church. It was antecedently probable, if not absolutely necessary, that the divine laws and influences which constituted the Kingdom should express themselves in a society. And when Jesus gathered around Him the Twelve, He was, in fact, forming the nucleus of such a society which has had a continuous existence ever since. It is surely very difficult to conceive that this was not contemplated by its Founder. Does not the very fact of the Church demand that its Founder should have had such a conception before Him? Is the Church in itself something greater than the conception of it in the mind of Jesus? Therefore, within the limits already laid down, we conceive of Jesus planning for His Church in the future. He did not provide any material for a code of ecclesiastical or social life. He simply created the germ which should produce

* *Cf.* Headlam, *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*—especially chaps. iv. and v. and pp. 40 and 200. A thoughtful study of this—the latest English life of Christ—is very convincing on this as well as on other points. *Cf.* also Rashdall, *Christus in Ecclesia*, where a sermon commences with the question, "Did Our Lord contemplate the existence of a Church?"

and permeate the society of His followers. He left His Church free to fashion itself under the Holy Spirit's guidance, free to embody itself in any type of organization which varying circumstances should demand. In the Acts and Epistles we follow the process and we see the Spirit of Jesus guiding and shaping His Church. There emerges as a natural development out of the Israelitish Church, a community which becomes the Church of the New Testament, the congregation of God's people linked on to the Old Testament Church, on the basis of faith in Jesus as the Messiah foretold by Old Testament writers. Any other plan, as, *e.g.*, settling for His Church the pattern its future ministry should adopt, would have been contrary to His mode of working. This was left for the Holy Spirit to determine. It was entirely in accordance with the method of Jesus, as well as with the best principles of pedagogy and psychology, to allow the experience of need first to arise, and then to satisfy the need. That is a spiritual law which Jesus always observed. Just as in the Gospels spiritual experience always precedes dogmatic formulation, the latter being the satisfaction of the former, so when Jesus is planning for His Church, He provides the Holy Spirit to satisfy the growing needs as they occur, but He does not forestall them. In the Acts we see this process actually going on. We see the needs arising and being carried to the Head of the Church for solution, and the provision being made. So we have to distinguish between our Lord's attitude to institutionalism as a whole and the abuse of institutionalism against which He

bore witness. Since God has created men with social instincts, since, as Baron von Hügel* has recently pointed out, a full and balanced spiritual life involves the mutual interplay of three elements or factors which he describes as the intellectual, mystical, and institutional elements of religion, Jesus could hardly have been opposed to reasonable institutionalism, though He would and did oppose the abuses of it which abounded in the Judaism of His day. And accepting the need itself, He wisely refused to fetter His Church with details of organization.

To sum up, I have spent so much time in considering the attitude of Jesus towards institutionalism—which, of course, was characteristic, not only of the Jewish Church, but of all extant religion, so that if Jesus was opposed to it, He was almost bound to be definite in saying so—because unless such half truths as are embodied in statements like "Jesus never created or thought of creating an organization," or "the Kingdom of Heaven is without organization and incapable of being organized" are faced and exposed, they mislead people in dealing with so vital a question as the possibility of Jesus instituting the rite of Holy Communion. No doubt the Christian Church is the product of evolution, but it has grown out of a seed planted by Christ Himself. In that sense Christ founded the Church. On the other hand, after the manner of divine operations in nature, Jesus was content to plant the germ with its infinite capabilities of

* Baron von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion.* Address on Institutional Christianity.

growth and not to fix in advance details of organization. In this way He founded the Church as the Society of the Kingdom of God. Of course, this does not prove that He instituted Holy Communion, yet it not only clears the ground for His doing so, but it makes the probability of such an action infinitely greater. Therefore, we may venture to say that His attitude towards institutionalism is found to be an argument in favour of, rather than against, the matter under discussion.

NOTE A

Bishop Headlam in *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* seems to me to show convincingly that the following conclusions fit in most simply and naturally with the Gospel records. (*a*) *Judaism and Christianity*. The religion of the time of Jesus stretched back into the Judaism of the past, and the living continuity of the religion of Jesus made His teaching suitable for those who heard it. Only the religion of Jesus always transcends its source. It is no longer negative but positive. It gives all which is most spiritual in the Old Testament, proclaiming as the central fact the Kingdom of God as the fulfilment of the Divine Will. The Old Testament was the source of Rabbinism. So the new teaching comprehended but superseded the old. Hence we see Jesus not only conforming to, but both reforming and transforming the Church of His day. (*b*) The appointment of the Twelve to preach, and still more to be with Him as learners, constituted an important stage in the foundation of the Christian Church. The separation of Jesus from the synagogue made another stage. The Galilean ministry of two years or more saw the organization of an embryo Church. (*c*) The founder of a religion is the one who has a creative mind, which enables him to impress himself upon his followers, and his successors are his interpreters. The existence of the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels, accounts for the different elements in the Apostolic age, and is not what the primitive Church was capable of creating of itself, and this harmonizes with the rest of the work and words of Jesus. The teaching of the Apostolic age is the natural develop-

ment of the teaching of the Gospel, expressing itself in new language. To deny the creative action of Jesus would be to credit His followers with powers which the Master did not possess.

NOTE B

The mistake made by those who describe our Lord as anti-institutional is well exposed by Du Bose in his instructive book, *The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 54, where he writes: "There are two errors against which we have very carefully to guard ourselves. The first is the idea that Jesus set Himself against the established order, against outward institutions, as such. He was the farthest from doing this. What He did set Himself against was the sin of an order or an institution, divinely established to serve an end, setting up itself as the end, sacrificing the true end to itself instead of itself to the end, reversing the divine law by being in the world to be served instead of to serve. He did not object to the visible temple. The zeal of it even ate Him up. What He did object to was . . . that men were making merchandise for themselves out of what had been instituted for the service of God." Obviously by His attitude to the Law, by His offering Himself for Baptism, by His use of the Temple, and the Synagogue Services, and the Sabbath, and by His encouraging His disciples to baptize, Jesus was not opposed to institutions in themselves.

LITERATURE FOR INSTITUTIONALISM

The literature on the subject is immense. In Hastings' *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics* there are three articles under "Church" by Church of England, Roman Catholic, and Presbyterian writers. In *Ency. Bibl.* see art. "Church," by Dean of Wells. For relation between Old Testament Church and New Testament Church see Hamilton, *The People of God.* For New Testament doctrine of Church, see A. Ritschl, *Die Enstehung die Altkath. Kirche*, 1857; R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, 1892; Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 1897; Royce, *The Problem of Christianity*, 1913, in which he says, "The idea of a world-wide community is the first Christian idea." Gore's *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, 1924, which treats of this subject, and of other subjects here dealt with, has appeared too late to be referred to in this book.

CHAPTER V

NEW TESTAMENT RECORDS

CAN THEY BE HARMONIZED?

1. NOTE ON EASTERN THOUGHT.
2. APPENDIX COMPARING VARIOUS NARRATIVES ABOUT THE LORD'S SUPPER, AND ESPECIALLY THOSE ABOUT THE CUP IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER V

Questions raised by differences in the reports of the words spoken by Jesus at the Supper. General agreement as to setting and incidents. In New Testament often unable to depend on having the very words of Jesus. Truth of idea rather than verbal accuracy. Modern ideas of reporting non-existent. Human element in inspiration. Impossibility of making satisfactory mosaic of words spoken at Supper. Analogy with Lord's Prayer. Only the words "This is My Body" common to all. Startling amount of divergence. This illustrated by the four different reports about the Cup. On the other hand, all main details harmonize. Scene faithfully and graphically drawn. Its general harmony a strong evidence of reliability.

CHAPTER V

NEW TESTAMENT RECORDS

Harmonizing New Testament Accounts

We now come to the New Testament records as we find them, and the first alleged difficulty is the want of such harmony among the various accounts of the Lord's Supper as can warrant dependence being placed upon them. If they are found to contradict one another, then the truth of the narrative would seem to be vitiated at its source. In this chapter we will confine ourselves to a general survey of the case, and keep the greater detail for the Appendix.* This difficulty, which must be fairly met, will be found to apply mainly to reports of the actual words spoken by Jesus, and not to the general setting or teaching of the accounts as a whole. To scholars who have learnt not to expect verbal agreement† in the way in which different New Testament writers narrate the same event and report the same conversation, this will not prove any real stumbling-block. On the other hand, the many points of agreement in various respects, and the striking verisimilitude of the narratives themselves will be strong evidence for the general reliability of the writers. In fact, the argument may be turned in the opposite direc-

* *Cf.* Appendix at close of chapter.

† *Cf.* Chap. VII., pp. 104 and 105.

tion, and the harmony amidst diversity may become a help to faith. Certainly no unbiassed person can arise from the careful study of the passages under discussion without having perceived the main drift of the story, compared to which the divergent details are of minor importance. It is well to say at the outset that so much new light has recently been let in upon the Gospels and the New Testament generally, that it is amply proved that in few, if in any, cases can we rely upon the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus having been handed down to us.* We shall presently find a characteristic instance of this in these various narratives of the Lord's Supper. The writers of the Gospels transmit historical traditions concerning Jesus with varying degrees of accuracy, and append to such varying kinds of interpretation. They cannot be regarded as mere chroniclers, and to them truth of idea ranks far above mere verbal literalism. Our modern conception of history, with its exacting demand for accuracy, is a plant of recent growth, and is the child of the scientific spirit and methods of our day.† Edification, judgment of value, not primarily objective history, still less science, is the Bible's aim. But, rightly regarded, this does not invalidate the narratives. We have always, behind the narratives, the great fact of the impelling personality of Christ, and of that unique personality we have sufficient and abundant testimony. While Christianity is a historical religion based on certain well-authenticated facts which are capable of proof, the narrative of the same has

* *Cf.* Chap. VII., pp. 104 and 105.

† *Cf.* Note on Eastern Thought at end of this chapter.

reached us through earthly channels. Exact reproduction of words and facts is not of the essence of religion. Not only do we find in the Bible "an extraordinary licence to employ allegory, myth, symbolism, legend, parable, in the interest of religious edification,"* but even where such are not made use of, God's way has always been to work through fallible men, and to leave plenty of room for the weak human element in the working. After He had manifested His Incarnate Son on earth, the work accomplished by Him still continued, directed from heaven, energized by the Holy Spirit, through a Mark, a Paul, a John, immensely different and fallible characters, but each helping to bring into significance for the Church's life some fragments of the earthly life of Jesus and what necessarily followed from it. So that we see God's method of revelation as set forth in Hebrews i. 1 ever being reproduced, even after Jesus had ascended. "But all these things worketh the selfsame Spirit."

No doubt to those who have been taught to look for verbal accuracy in the reports of our Lord's sayings, this may prove a great disappointment, for it is quite impossible to make a satisfactory mosaic of our Lord's words on the occasion of the historic Supper, or even to guarantee that we possess the actual words as they fell from His lips. This is not like some other instances in His life—*e.g.*, the wording of the Lord's Prayer, where in trying to account for the differences in the reports, we might prefer to think that our double version is due to

* *Jesus and Paul*, B. W. Bacon, p. 247.

His having spoken on different occasions the words which are differently reported. What He said here He must have said once for all.

It will be found that no two of the four reports agree entirely, not even does St. Matthew agree with St. Mark, whom he so very often reproduces. In the Greek there is only one sentence of five words which is common to all four writers, and this in English reads, "This is My Body," while even here the order of words in St. Paul differs somewhat, and the words appended are not the same.

In fact, the amount of divergence is quite surprising, and if Jesus said what St. Mark affirms that He said, He cannot have said exactly what St. Paul or St. Luke affirms that He said.

While reserving till later* a fuller description of the various accounts of their differences, in order to illustrate what we have said, let us take two examples, both dealing with the Cup.

1. In regard to the giving of the Cup, St. Matthew prefaces the gift with "Drink ye all of it," words which are not found in any of the other three; though knowing as we do that St. Matthew had St. Mark's Gospel before him as he wrote, we may reasonably conjecture that it is an inference by St. Matthew from St. Mark's words, "And they all drank of it." This simple instance well illustrates the sort of divergence which is constantly met with. What St. Mark mentions as a detail which occurred, St. Matthew apparently transfers to the lips of Jesus.

2. St. Mark makes Jesus say, "This is My Blood of the Covenant which is shed for many." St.

* *Cf.* Appendix at close of chapter.

Matthew repeats the words, but adds to them "for the remission of sins." St. Luke (assuming that verses 19 and 20 are to be omitted) merely makes Jesus say, "Take this and divide it among yourselves."* St. Paul makes Him say, "This Cup is the New Covenant in My Blood. This do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me." It is obvious that while the teaching is the same, or nearly so, yet the words are reported differently, and that there is no certainty as to which words Jesus actually used. He cannot possibly have used them all, though all are put into His lips. Of course the chief difference of all lies in the injunction found in St. Paul (and said to have been twice spoken), "Do this in remembrance of Me," and if we could quite confidently determine that Jesus said those words, we should have a perfectly satisfactory answer to the main question of our book. Those who doubt that the words were said, have obviously St. Paul to reckon with, and the more St. Paul is studied, the more we feel he can take care of his own reputation in every direction. But we must reserve this matter for future consideration (see Chapter VII.).

Meanwhile, though we have to allow a seeming inconsistency of the four accounts, so far as the exact words spoken are concerned, on the other hand everything goes to show that the actual scene itself is reliably portrayed, and that all the main details which are vital are conveyed to us.

We can see the Master reclining in the Upper

* The question of verses 19*b* and 20 in St. Luke xxii. will be considered later. At present they are not called in witness.

Room, surrounded by His disciples, and the following details are found in all four of the accounts:

(*a*) Taking Bread.
(*b*) Giving thanks.
(*c*) Breaking Bread.
(*d*) Uttering the words "This is My Body."
(*e*) Taking the Cup.
(*f*) Blessing the Cup.

While, in addition, each writer makes certain contributions of his own, which fit into the whole, and enable us to picture and reconstruct the scene, and moreover to understand something at least of what it all meant. Small as the space occupied is, there is no other scene in the Gospels described with so much detail as this one, and we cannot fail to recognize a general harmony which affords strong evidence of its reliability. We shall, *e.g.*, find a tremendous contrast, if we turn to the Old Testament and note how differently, what purports to be the same occurrence, will be narrated in Kings and Chronicles, or if coming to later days and comparing our New Testament reports of the Lord's Supper with those we find in the Apostolic Constitutions, ii. 57 and viii. 12, we contrast the elaborate ceremonial with which a later age would have surrounded it. Such a radical scholar as Eichhorn admits that all four writers speak of the selfsame thing in the very same sense.*

To sum up, while we must allow that the diversity of the reports does, to a certain extent, prevent our

* *Das Abendmahl in Neutestament*, p. 8.

laying stress on any particular words put into the lips of Jesus having been certainly uttered by Him, we may heartily accept the trustworthiness of the narratives as a whole, and feel that to reject them because of the difficulties they present, would raise infinitely greater difficulties. Our duty therefore is to use them as historical documents worthy of credit and to endeavour to interpret them within the limits of honest enquiry and criticism.

NOTE ON EASTERN THOUGHT

Any who may wish to pursue further the contrast between Eastern and Western ways of narrative are referred to *The Approach to the New Testament*, by Moffatt, who on pp. 122-3 discusses the problem of the presence of Midrashic influences in the New Testament. Midrash means exposition aiming at edification, or stories told to illustrate some religious truths, without the strict regard to history which modern writers desiderate. Moffatt points out the need of an orientation of mind as an indispensable preliminary to the understanding of Eastern thought, since Jewish teaching was not abstract in discourse, but appealed to the imagination by embodying its message in a story, parable, or allegory, or seeming historical narrative; and the last thing asked was, "Are the persons or events or circumstances real or fictitious?" This habit was part of the mental equipment of the writers of the Gospels. The student is also recommended to read an article on Imagination by E. Shillito in *The Pilgrim*, July, 1921, where the writer points out that the very first essential in reading any literature is the discovery of the meaning that it had to those who wrote it and to those who first read it. Scholarship alone cannot enable us to make this discovery, and faith or imaginative insight is also needed. The writer says that no one has suffered more from the unimaginative reader than St. Paul, and imagination may save us from the tendency to read into the language of the Bible the lowest possible meaning. (Surely our German friends are often very guilty here!) It is easy for criticism to reduce the words to their most prosaic meaning, and to treat the sacred writers as though they were unable to

reach heights which we think we can reach. We should aim at so interpreting the Scripture, that if it were possible for the dead to listen to us, they might say, "This is what we meant, though we scarcely saw all that was involved in our words."

Myers, in *Catholic Thoughts on the Bible and Theology*, pp. 112, 124, says:

"We have to judge the Bible, especially the Old Testament, with an Asiatic measure generally, with an antique one always. Modern Occidentalism is a wholly unjust line, if the only one: and to apply the rules of logic to the language of piety or of poetry, or remorselessly to analyze the warm rich life of Eastern imagery and passion, is but the sign of a hopeless and fruitless exposition. . . . Let there be the freest and fullest application of all Eastern lights to the interpretation of scriptural modes of thought and feeling." In G. Adam Smith's commentaries on Isaiah and Amos, and in Browning's *The Ring and the Book* and *A Death in the Desert*,* we find the same treatment exemplified.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER V. ON HARMONIZING NEW TESTAMENT ACCOUNTS

In attempting to compare historically the various accounts, and to determine their respective values, we must remember that while St. Paul's is the earliest, and as a tradition probably goes back to a period shortly after the Crucifixion, that does not in itself establish its superiority. A tradition put later into writing may clearly be more dependable than one written earlier. Taking the four different accounts, and comparing them, we can divide them under three heads which may later be reduced to two.

1. Mark and Matthew make one narrative with slight variations.
2. Luke's account calls for choice between the shorter and longer texts, and an appraisal of the value and meaning of each.
3. Paul's account, written earliest, gives important additions.

* *E.g.*, the aged St. John says:

"Since much that at the first, in deed and word,
Lay simply and sufficiently exposed,
Had grown . . .
Of new significance and fresh result.
What first were guessed as points, I now knew stars,
And named them in the Gospel I have writ."

1. We may here eliminate Matthew as dependent on Mark or on a common source.

There are three variations worth noticing.

(*a*) Matthew says, "Take, eat" instead of Mark's "Eat," thereby softening the abruptness.

(*b*) Matthew says, "Drink ye all of it," instead of "They all drank of it," thereby establishing parallelism with "Take, eat."

(*c*) Matthew adds, after the word "shed," "for the remission of sins," which is explanatory and doctrinal.

Perhaps all three may be liturgical. The two accounts are set side by side below.

2. There is considerable difficulty in determining the claims of the longer and shorter texts of Luke, and we have to ask whether we are to follow Westcott and Hort in disallowing 19*b* and 20. W. and H. regard these as "a Western non-interpolation," a phrase requiring explanation, and indicating an interpolation into all texts except Western ones. Many scholars regard the shorter text as authentic, and as embodying the earliest extant tradition.* They consider the narrative as complete in itself, and point out that it contains both a cup and bread, with accompanying words of Jesus. They ascribe the additional words of 19*b* and 20, which are in almost verbal agreement with 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, to some harmonizing scribe, whether he copied from St. Paul or not. Whether we are to regard the Lucan account as a third narrative, to be put into competition with Mark and Paul, will depend upon the view we take on these problems. Discussion on this question will be found in Chapter VII., Appendix I. Below we place Luke and Paul in parallel columns.

3. Paul's account is the fullest, and in Chapter VII. we shall consider how far we may regard it as strictly literal, or how much of interpretation may be thought to have entered in. The great influence it has had upon the doctrine and practice of the Church would not necessarily be invalidated, if we were unable to regard its additions as historically authenticated. So long as it conveys to us the meaning of Jesus, made plain to His

* *Cf.* "The shorter text of St. Luke gives us by far the best attested narrative of the whole incident. . . . The Lucan account seems to me the most primitive narrative which has come down to us" (Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, p. 44). See also note to p. 32 above.

disciples and the early Church, it is authoritative, even if the words "Do this," etc., were never actually uttered. If we put side by side Mark's version and Paul's, we find the former shorter in more than one place, and as expansion is easier than abbreviation, we should naturally conclude either that the words Paul adds are explanatory, or at any rate come from a later source than Mark's simpler and shorter statement. There are indications of alterations in Paul, fitting in with his special theology. The result of our comparison will be to show that Mark and Paul are in substantial agreement concerning the form and meaning of the event and the circumstances of the institution. Both represent Jesus on the night of the Betrayal holding a farewell meal, taking the loaf and saying, "This is My Body." Both mention a cup, and associate it with blood shed in connection with a Covenant. In both the meal is exhibited as celebrating the sacrificial death of Christ.

Every student is recommended to make his own synopsis of the various New Testament narratives. The following will illustrate what has already been said, and we indicate at the end of this Appendix where fuller tables can be found. Beginning with the tradition which represents the common source underlying the three Synoptic Gospels, and setting side by side St. Mark and St. Matthew, we find—

St. Mark xiv. 22.	St. Matt. xxvi. 26.
As they were eating	As they were eating
He took a loaf and blessed	Jesus took a loaf, and blessed,
And broke and gave to them and said:	And gave it to His disciples, saying:
Take, this is My Body.	Take, *eat*, this is My Body.
And taking a cup, having given thanks,	And taking a cup, *and* having given thanks,
He gave it to them	He gave it to them,
And they all drank of it, and He said to them,	Saying, *Drink of it, all of you.*
This is My Blood of the Covenant	*For* this is my Blood of the Covenant
Which is shed on behalf of many.	Which for many is shed *for remission of sins.*

We may with confidence accept St. Mark's account as the one which most faithfully reproduces the underlying document.

If next we compare St. Luke and St. Paul, we find—

St. Luke xxii. 17.

And He received a cup, and gave thanks, and said: Take this and divide it among yourselves: for I tell you I will not drink from now of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God has come.

And taking bread, giving thanks,
*He brake and gave to them, saying,**
This is My Body
[Which on your behalf is given.
Do this unto My remembrance (or memorial).

Also the cup likewise after supper, saying:
This cup (is) the New Covenant in My Blood
Which on your behalf is shed.]

1 Cor. xi. 23.

He took bread and giving thanks
He brake and said,
This is My Body
Which (is) on your behalf.
Do this unto my remembrance (or memorial).

Likewise also the cup after supper, saying:
This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood.

This do, as often as you drink (it)
Unto My remembrance (or memorial).

St. Luke's account seems to show three distinct strains:

1. Peculiar to himself—*e.g.*, that the Passover was not to be taken nor the wine drunk till the Kingdom of God had come.†

2 and 3. The Marcan and the Pauline traditions interwoven.

For historical purposes we seem to be thrown back on the Marcan and Pauline accounts, and there are signs that the Marcan one is the earliest setting of the words spoken. It may also be useful to demonstrate the way in which our "Prayer of Consecration," so far as concerns the Cup—in which the differences in the

* The parts in italics agree with St. Mark, as against St. Paul.

† In Mark and Matthew the declaration concerning the traitor occurs at the beginning and in Luke at the end; verses 14, 15, 16 in Luke show independence of Mark and Matthew, every word of 14 and 15 and most of 16 differing from it.

narratives are greatest—is derived from the four sources we are considering.

Likewise after Supper	Paul (Luke).
He took the cup,	Mark, Matt.
and when He had given thanks,	Mark, Matt.
He gave it to them,	Mark, Matt.
saying, Drink ye all of this, for	Matt.
This is My Blood	Mark, Matt.
of the (New) Testament,	Mark, Matt. " New " Paul*
which is shed for you	(Luke).
and for many	Mark, Matt.
for the remission of sins.	Matt.
Do this . . . Me.	Paul.

Textual comparisons will be found in *Synopsis Evangelica*, Tischendorf; *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, Wright; Hastings' *D. of Ch. and the Gospels*, art. " Lord's Supper," p. 66, Falconer; *The Early Eucharist*, Franklin; *L'Eucharistie*, p. 118, Goguel; *The Body of Christ*, Gore.

---

* Mark and Matthew's " This is My Blood of the Covenant " is more original than Paul's " This Cup is the New Covenant in My Blood," which seems to be interpretation for the Gentiles. The words mean " My Blood is being shed to unite you in Covenant with God."

CHAPTER VI

DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER

SYNOPTISTS AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

FOUR APPENDICES.

A. THE SYNOPTIC DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER.

B. THE EUCHARIST. A FREE CHURCH VIEW, AND THE EUCHARIST IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

C. ST. JOHN AND CHRISTIAN ART.

D. NOTE ON THE FEEDING OF THE 5,000 AND THE EUCHARIST.

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER VI

Disagreement between Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel as to date of Crucifixion and Last Supper. The historical claims of the Fourth Gospel. Not a case of one authority against three, for St. Mark here the authority for St. Matthew and St. Luke. St. Mark responsible for the Paschal date. Proofs that St. Mark fixes date as 14th Nisan, and regards it as a Paschal Feast, as against 13th Nisan of Fourth Gospel. Yet several inconsistencies in Synoptic accounts. Consideration of St. Luke xxii. 15, 16. It probably refers to an unfulfilled desire. Proofs that the Fourth Gospel clearly dates Supper a day earlier than the Synoptists. Does St. Paul help us? His authority claimed by both sides, but he probably favours earlier date. The inherent improbability of the Crucifixion falling on the Feast Day. Various strong confirmatives of Fourth Gospel date. Was it the Kiddush, or an anticipatory Passover, or an ordinary Jewish meal, transformed into the Lord's Supper? Lessons suggested by the difficulties of the problem. No vital issue at stake. The omission of "Lord's Supper" from the Fourth Gospel explained. Light the Fourth Gospel throws on the subject. Appendix A, Synoptic Date of Last Supper. Appendix B, The Eucharist, A Free Church View, referring to arts. in *Concerning Prayer*, and in *Mansfield College Essays* (by Rev. J. V. Bartlet), questioning the fact of an institution by Jesus. Appendix C, Note on St. John and Christian Art. Appendix D, Note on the Feeding of the 5,000 and the Eucharist.

CHAPTER VI

DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER

Conflict between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel

The question raised by a comparison of the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel, in the matter of the date of the Crucifixion and of the Supper which preceded it, is specially interesting, not only by reason of the bearing it has upon the reliability of the Gospel narratives as a whole, but because of the tendency at the present time to regard the Fourth Gospel as interpretation and reflection rather than history. Now the Fourth Gospel gives an account of the Last Supper, without however mentioning what we are accustomed to speak of as "the Lord's Supper." If, as seems likely, a careful study of the passage in question leads to an acceptance of the chronology of the Fourth Gospel, rather than of the Synoptists, it will be a warning against undervaluing the historical claims of this Gospel, however rightly we at the same time value its wealth of spiritual interpretation. It will also remind us that the Fourth Gospel draws on trustworthy sources of information other than, and sometimes superior to, the Synoptists, and is not

only independent of them but also valuable for checking their accuracy, and that its testimony may therefore be found in some cases to be more reliable than they are. But, at the outset, we should be on our guard against a misconception. It is not a question, as might appear at first, of balancing one Gospel against three other independent Gospels. It will be found to be simply a case of one authority *versus* another authority. For in this particular there can be no doubt that St. Mark is the original authority on which the other two Synoptists (as so often) depend. Every student of the Synoptic problem knows that this is common in St. Matthew and very frequent in St. Luke, and although St. Luke's account of the Last Supper is a very independent one, and we have only to compare it with the two which precede, to see how much it differs from them, still St. Mark is clearly one main source of St. Luke here, and St. Luke seems, at least, to agree with the two others on the question of date (see, however, p. 83 below).* Anyhow, it is quite safe to say that all the statements in St. Matthew and St. Luke which imply that the Last Supper was a Paschal meal are taken from St. Mark.† And we may go further and even "seriously question whether the theory that the Last Supper was the Paschal meal had any existence before St. Mark wrote his Gospel."‡ That Gospel,

* Nearly every word in St. Luke xxii. 14 differs from St. Mark and St. Matthew, the whole of verse 15 and most of 16 are peculiar to St. Luke.

† Professor Burkitt in *J.T.S.*, ix., p. 57.

‡ *Idem.*

we believe, was written at Rome about thirty years after the events it describes.*

Also if it were possible to show that St. Mark had been misled—and there are many indications of this—or to explain in what way he became mistaken, then we should not only account for the whole of the Synoptic disagreement with the Fourth Gospel, but be able also to see how the author of that Gospel, if he has not deliberately corrected the Synoptic account, has at least handed down to us the more accurate tradition.†

The case may be shortly stated thus: (*a*) The Fourth Gospel places the Last Supper on *the day before the Passover—i.e.*, 13th Nisan; (*b*) the three Synoptists seem distinctly to connect it *with the Passover—i.e.*, the 14th Nisan, and to make of it a Paschal meal.

The following references will make this abundantly clear: St. Mark. xiv. 12 ("On the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover"); St. Matt. xxvi. 17 ("On the first day of unleavened bread . . . where wilt Thou that we make ready for Thee to eat the passover?"); St. Luke xxii. 7 ("The day of unleavened bread on which the passover must be sacrificed"); though even here inconsistencies and details, which accord better with the position taken up by the Fourth Gospel, occur. It is probable that with our

* For reliability of St. Mark's Gospel as a whole *cf.* Headlam, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*, pp. 8-15, and *cf.* Note at close of Chap. VII.

† *Cf.* art. *J.T.S.*, vol. xvii., pp. 291-297, where a possible explanation of St. Mark's mistake is given by Professor Burkitt, who throws much light on the question we are considering.

present knowledge we are unable to reconcile the difference. It is, however, our duty to sift and to weigh carefully the evidence. In Appendix A will be found further detailed proof of what has been said about the Synoptists and their date. On the other hand, there are the following points in St. Mark which seem to imply that in spite of the date now embedded in the Synoptic record, the Passover had *not* begun when Jesus was crucified, and which accordingly make for the date given in the Fourth Gospel: (1) We find no distinctive Paschal features,* the story simply referring to the Covenant Sacrifice of Exodus xxiv. 8 (as against this view see Lambert, *The Sacraments of the New Testament*, pp. 253, 297 *f.*). (2) St. Mark xiv. 1 says, "After *two* days was the Feast of the Passover." (3) St. Mark xiv. 2 says, "Not on the Feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people." (4) In St. Mark xiv. 47 there are also references to the carrying of weapons, the trial itself, the buying of spices, which are all inconsistent with the Passover having begun, as all work was then prohibited. (5) There is no mention of a Passover lamb† nor of any sort of flesh, nor of unleavened bread, and the word St. Mark uses for "bread," in verse 22, does not suggest an unleavened cake. (6) In St. Mark xv. 21 the arrival of Simon out of the country suggests the same conclusion. Leaving St. Mark,

* "Not a single feature *peculiar* to the Passover" (Kennett, *The Last Supper*, p. 6). The singing of a hymn, often connected with the Hallel, might occur on any solemn occasion.

† Wellhausen thinks that dipping in the dish (verse 20) suggests this.

let us briefly consider one expression in St. Luke's account, which does not occur in St. Mark, but which, if the interpretation adopted below be correct, points strongly in the same direction. St. Luke puts into the lips of Jesus the words "with desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer," etc., etc.;* and this, on the face of it, has been held to be confirmatory of the Paschal date. On the other hand, there is now a strong inclination among some scholars† to see in it an unfulfilled *and not a fulfilled desire, a note of regret and disappointment* rather than a sigh of relief; it would then mean "I have greatly longed to keep this Passover with you, but now I see that it will not be possible." If this be the right interpretation, it would of course imply, not that it was, but that it was *not* a Paschal meal. On the other hand, when we reach the Fourth Gospel we are not left for a moment in doubt of the view its author takes—viz., that the Last Supper took place on the evening of the 13th Nisan, the Passover commencing on the 14th Nisan, the lambs being slain on the afternoon of the 14th and being eaten after sunset, *i.e.* at the beginning of 15th Nisan.‡ This would, of course, make our Lord's death coincide with the slaying of the lambs, a most suitable and striking coincidence. The following quotations will show

* *Cf.* St. Luke xxii. 15, 16.

† *Cf.* articles by Professors Burkitt and Brooke, *J.T.S.*, ix., pp. 569 *ff.*, and Kennett, *The Last Supper*, where this is worked out with much force.

‡ As differing from the view here taken, *cf.* Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii.

this clearly: St. John xiii. 1, "Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end"; St. John xiii. 29, the disciples thought that Jesus was directing Judas to "buy what things we had need of for the feast"; St. John xviii. 28, the Jews refused to enter the hall of Pilate, "that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover"; St. John xix. 14, the day of the Crucifixion was "the preparation of the passover;" St. John xix. 36, Jesus is identified with the Passover lamb, which is implied in the reference to Exod. xii. 46, and Num. ix. 12.

We must not overlook that we have yet another author to turn to—*i.e.*, St. Paul. Does he throw any light on the question of date? His testimony has been claimed for both sides. For the Synoptic date it is claimed that St. Paul has Paschal references in 1 Cor. xi. 23 *f.*, as he uses the word "memorial" (*cf.* Exod. xii. 14), and he speaks of "proclaiming" the Lord's death, which corresponds with the Paschal Haggada, and again of the "Cup of blessing," possibly corresponding to the third Cup of the Passover.* On the other side, and in support of the Fourth Gospel—and the weight of argument would seem to rest here—St. Paul speaks of "Christ our Passover" (1 Cor. v. 7), which would agree with our Lord's Crucifixion coinciding with the killing of the

* As against this view see Spitta, *Ur Christenthum*, p. 248; Bickell, *Messe und Pascha* (Eng. trans.); and *The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual*, p. 163.

Paschal lambs. Moreover, the expression he adopts to fix his date "on the night that He was betrayed," though neutral in itself, might, if the Synoptists are right, easily have been "at the last Passover." Also it is noticeable that it is the New Covenant rather than any link with the Old which interests St. Paul. Dean Armitage Robinson suggests that the fact that the Eucharist soon became regarded as commemorative of the redemption effected by the death of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 26), and that Christ is spoken of as "our Passover" (*ibid.* v. 7) may have led to the identification of the Supper with the Paschal meal, and have affected the chronology.*

There are, of course, certain general considerations which support the view of the Fourth Gospel. The High Priest and his council would naturally be very fully occupied on the Feast Day, and we have seen in St. Mark (xiv. 2) their definite wish to avoid it. Acts xii. 4 indicates the same feeling with regard to proceedings pending against St. Peter ("intending after the Passover to bring him forth to the people").

The result, therefore, of weighing impartially the evidence is this. However unwilling we may at first be to sacrifice the Synoptists in favour of the Fourth Gospel, yet we are led to adopt the clear and consistent statements of the latter, rather than the confused and confusing testimony of the former. All this, of course, leaves unsettled the question why

* Art. in *Ency. Bibl.*, "Eucharist." In *J.T.S.*, xvii., pp. 293, 297, it is pointed out that the difference of date in the Gospels is reflected in the difference of East and West over the ritual use or non-use of azymes (or unleavened cakes) as in the Quarto-deciman controversy.

Jesus should have kept a pre-Paschal meal. Of the various conjectures put forward in explanation of this, one of the most likely is that which connects it, not with the Paschal meal itself, but with the Kiddūsh* or Sanctification for the Passover. The Kiddūsh was a weekly domestic ceremony, a sanctification of the Sabbath, in which a cup of wine and then some bread were solemnly blessed and distributed to the household before the evening meal. Kiddūsh also preceded great festivals, including the Passover. (This view has the advantage of explaining the order in St. Luke where the cup precedes the bread; *cf.* also 1 Cor. x. 16, and the Didache; though, of course, against this explanation are the accounts of St. Mark and St. Paul, which carry more weight, and where the thanksgiving over the bread precedes the thanksgiving over the cup.)† If this could be established it might also help to explain why the disciples afterwards adopted a weekly commemoration of the Lord's Supper, and critics have at times urged the difficulty of finding a memorial of a festival such as the annual Passover converted into a weekly rite. This difficulty would be increased if it could be shown that daily Communion was a practice of the Early Church. Bishop Lightfoot once said to the author, that he felt sure this was not so. History bears out his opinion. There have been also suggestions of an anticipatory Passover, such as Jesus, of course, might have thought it well to celebrate,‡

* *Cf.* G. H. Boxin *J.T.S.*, iii. 357-369, and H. D. of *Religion and Ethics*, p. 542.

† As against this view *cf. J.T.S.*, xvii. 294.

‡ Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, ed. Leipzig, 1908, p. 11; *cf.* also p. 178 *f.* for another solution.

although there seems little proof that such Passovers were ever held. It is also possible that the Last Supper corresponds to, and arises out of, no Jewish ceremony at all, but was just a simple farewell feast which Jesus and His twelve disciples were keeping together before the awful tragedy which was impending, and that, as He had turned water into wine at the Feast of Cana, He now transferred and transmuted this family gathering into the wonderful occasion which it then and henceforth became.* It is certainly very probable that our Lord here employed the ordinary Jewish forms of blessing used at meals, and that the procedure was much like the regular Jewish household prayers, and as such, had often been used before by Him and His disciples.

Puzzled and disappointed as we may be when we find so much confusion in these accounts, and in a matter which uncritical readers have always considered to be a very simple and straightforward one, we shall do well to reflect (1) how a wholesome warning is herein given against mechanical or exaggerated views of inspiration, showing that God does not undertake to save us from the need and labour of critical investigation; (2) how abbreviated and short the different accounts are, thus largely increasing the difficulty of explaining them; (3) that it is not the outward accidents of the Supper which meant most to the disciples or to the Evangelists, and that we should beware of allowing them to weigh too much with us; (4) that to whichever date or origin we incline, the essentials

* *Cf. J.T.S.*, xvii., p. 295, and appendix on *The Eucharist: a Free Church View.*

are the same. It was the Passover season, and the scene is shot with Passover associations, while whether Jesus gave His Body and Blood at a Passover meal, or was Himself sacrificed at the Passover blood-shedding (having on the previous night consecrated Himself to that awful sacrifice, and having given His disciples a share in the same consecrative action), either would be pregnant with meaning and abundantly fruitful of future spiritual blessings for His Church. Therefore it is impossible to allow that there is any vital issue at stake, or to permit an unsolved problem of date to prove any hindrance to belief. Furthermore, the absence of any account of the Lord's Supper or of an institution of Holy Communion in the Fourth Gospel, which has at times been urged as invalidating the probability of the latter having taken place, is not in any degree difficult to explain. We have only to reflect that that Gospel is avowedly supplementary, and when it was written, the custom of the Eucharist was already fully established, and that the writer would naturally not feel it necessary to repeat what was thus thoroughly recognized. Also, while the origin of neither of the two great Christian Sacraments is narrated in the Fourth Gospel, the need of both is emphasized, and the truths underlying both are insisted upon (*vide* St. John iii. and vi.); and though we are unable to say that St. John vi. refers exclusively to the Christian Eucharist, it is only because it expresses a larger idea of which the Eucharist is a particular embodiment, the one leading embodiment which Christ has bequeathed. Moreover, expressions which are found in St.

John vi. only become really intelligible in the light of after Christian Eucharistic experiences.* It is interesting to note that the teaching of the Fourth Gospel as to the truths underlying the two Sacraments in both cases arises out of the question, "How can these things be?" and provides material for a reply.† The two first appearances of Nicodemus come in strikingly at these junctures. In the case of the first Sacrament, the question is put by him to Jesus, and it is shortly after the storm of persecution which follows the discourse about the second Sacrament that Nicodemus appears again, and puts in a plea on behalf of Jesus.

APPENDIX A: THE SYNOPTIC DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER

This date, as already stated, is due to St. Mark; therefore it will be well to set out carefully the passages in that Gospel which imply that the Last Supper was the Paschal meal. They are St. Mark xiv. 12, 21, and 26. Verses 22-25, which contain the actual account of the Lord's Supper, would fit either date, and on the whole are easier of explanation on the other tradition. Verse 12 says: "Now on the first day of unleavened bread when they sacrificed the passover," and this has often been described as a contradiction in terms, as all Jewish scholars are agreed that the first day of unleavened bread was the 15th Nisan, and the sacrificing the lambs was always 14th Nisan, and, if so, there is here a mistake at the

* *Cf.* Nairne, *The Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 165 and 166; and "There can be no doubt that the truth which is presented in its absolute form in these discourses is presented in a specific act and in a concrete form in Holy Communion; and yet further that the Holy Communion is the divinely appointed means whereby men may realize the truth" (Bishop Westcott, Note on *St. John* vi. 58). *Cf.* also Holtzmann, *New Testament Theol.*, ii. 501-503; and Loisy, 4^me *Evangile*, 702-722, 760, 811.

† *Cf. Ency. Bibl.*, art. "Eucharist"; and Nairne, *ut supra*, p. 198.

outset. It has been suggested that the original Aramaic text may have read something like " before the day of unleavened bread " (*cf.* Resch, and see H. D. of *Relig. and Ethics*, art. " Eucharist," p. 542).

Professor Burkitt, however, argues that it is conceivable that the 14th Nisan may be reckoned as the first day of unleavened bread, as no leaven was eaten on that day after the first meal, and if so the date would mean the 14th Nisan, and the evening meal of verse 17 would mean the 15th Nisan—*i.e.*, it is the Passover meal which had been prepared by the two disciples (verse 16). *Cf. J.T.S.*, xvii. 293. However we interpret this, it is clear that St. Mark and St. Luke identify the Supper with the day on which the Passover Lamb was killed (see St. Luke xxii. 1, 7, 8, 11, 13), while St. Matthew, as we have seen, reproduces St. Mark throughout the scene. On the other hand, as already stated, St. Luke has two sources that he draws from, and while St. Matthew's Passion story entirely follows St. Mark, it is far otherwise with St. Luke. In chapters xx.-xxiv. we trace the influence of St. Mark, but we discover also another source, which is, in fact, the main authority. St. Luke xxii. 1-13, 18, 21-23, 39, 52, 53, are taken from St. Mark, and some other passages, but this leaves important gaps, and it seems highly probable that the other source used did not support the Paschal date. In *J.T.S.*, ix. 36, already referred to, Dr. Brooke says: "May we not add St. Luke xxv. 15, 16, to the indications, considerable in number, that the so-called Synoptic view of the Last Supper is not the view which lies behind, or is presupposed by the earliest forms of the tradition which they embody?" The verses here referred to have already been discussed in the text of this book (*cf.* p. 83).

APPENDIX B

In "The Eucharist: A Free Church View," being an article in *Concerning Prayer*, the following statement occurs: " Till recent years it has been the common assumption of all parties that at the Last Supper our Lord instituted the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Critical scholarship, except to those who on other grounds are compelled to hold to the traditional view,* has made this assumption

* It is not clear exactly who the writer includes in this, but certainly not any who are willing to " strive for the truth unto death " (Ecclus. iv. 28).

extremely uncertain. It is suggested that the words at the Last Supper instituting a new rite in perpetuity are due to St. Paul's influence. . . . In the light of the evidence which modern scholarship affords, it seems most probable that at the Last Supper Christ instituted no new rite." The writer then derives the Eucharist from the constant ordinary evening meals of the Master and His disciples, and such gatherings as the feeding of the five thousand, and adds: "In the light of current Jewish practice, such forms and thanksgivings at the table at which the head of the house presided, were almost inevitable; no special significance attached to the elements, which were varied according to circumstances, and normally in the primitive Church there seems to have been no reference to the Last Supper." His next sentence will appear to some to have the nature of somewhat special and inconclusive pleading, for he adds: "It seems probable that in the Corinthian Church at their *Lord's Supper* there was no reference to the *Last Supper*, and Paul reminds them of the *Last* Supper in order to give them a sense of the dignity and solemnity of their 'Lord's Supper.' . . . But the Last Supper was only one, though a specially solemn one, of a series of Eucharists, and the essence of the rite is the common meal with the giving of thanks."

Whether we are able or not to agree with the writer in his negative conclusions, we shall probably agree that in his positive suggestions there is much which is valuable and which commends itself to our careful consideration. In *Mansfield College Essays* there is an article by the Rev. J. V. Bartlet, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Mansfield College, entitled "The Eucharist in the Early Church." The professor says: "There is nothing in St. Mark's story—or in the parallel form found in the later Gospel according to St. Matthew—to suggest that Jesus was 'instituting' a religious rite for repetition in his society, the Messianic Church, any more than by the feet-washing in the Fourth Gospel." He proceeds to examine the evidence of St. Luke and St. Paul on the point, and concludes: "It is hard to believe that, had all the words which St. Paul puts into Jesus' lips been part of the Eucharistic tradition passed on from the first by the original Apostles, they could have failed to mould even the form of the Church's 'breaking of bread' more than is implied by all our evidence. Probably, then, the words enjoining recurrent remembrance of Christ in the Christian

meal were St. Paul's own expression of the spirit of the Last Supper, as read in the light of his personal knowledge of the Lord in the Spirit. They are part of St. Paul's explanatory paraphrase, meant to bring out the full sense of the historical Supper in its bearing upon the Church's practice, and showing in its emphasis traces of St. Paul's own mind, like *the other features* in which his wording deviates from St. Mark and St. Matthew. . . . Thus the notion of Christ's *formal* institution of the Lord's Supper falls to the ground, as due to St. Paul, possibly to a misreading of him, first by St. Luke, and afterwards by Christians generally."

The writer then traces back the origin of the Lord's Supper, as in the last case quoted, to "facts familiar to Jews, but unrealized by Christians"—viz., "Sabbath meals and those on other feast days, including the Paschal meal, which were but special forms of the fundamental common meal of a domestic type, where the home-father was priest." These he regards as "the prime antecedents for the Lord's Supper in the early Church," which itself was simply "one historic member of the series."

APPENDIX C: NOTE ON ST. JOHN AND CHRISTIAN ART

In the *Hibbert Journal* for July, 1922, in an article on "St. John and Christian Art," Dr. Gray, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, suggests that St. John purposely omits such portions of the Last Supper as refer to the sad details of Jesus' death, for the same reason that at times he omits or softens other similar details. His Upper Room discourse overflows with peace and comfort and love, there is no agony in the Garden, and the sayings from the Cross are triumphant. The writer points out the clear analogy with early art. Just as the painters of the first three centuries do not reproduce the Crucifixion, or the sad scenes preceding it, nor even use the emblem of the Cross, so St. John reflects the same attitude, and instead of the Lord's Supper with its painful associations of a shortly dying Lord, he gives us an early breakfast by the Lake, ministered by the Risen Master, who has conquered death. Dr. Gray draws attention to the absence from the art of the Cata-

combs,* of any scene or symbol which has any clear reference to the Pauline conception of the Eucharist of Bread and Wine, although the Agape itself is often pictured—*i.e.*, the eating together the common Christian meal. He considers this omission all the more significant, because scenes of baptizing and symbols of baptism are frequent.

In St. John we have no hint of the solemn consecration of the Bread and the Cup. Instead we have the "washing of feet," not as a rite enjoined, but merely as "a pattern," a suggestion or example to govern future conduct. Ceremonial ordinance, whether as Baptism or the Eucharist, finds no part in his Gospel. Yet Baptism and the Agape meal were existing customs in Christian countries when the Fourth Gospel was written, and the former is symbolically explained to Nicodemus in chap. iii., and the latter is explained in St. John vi., so that the parallelism is complete. In either case the writer was dealing with an ordinance existing and assumed to be the final instruction and legacy of Christ Himself.

APPENDIX D: NOTE ON THE FEEDING OF THE 5,000 AND THE EUCHARIST

Many writers see a significance in the way the Fourth Gospel connects together the two facts mentioned above. In St. Mark in the use of the same terms for "giving thanks" (which occurs in Mark viii. 6 and is implied in chapter vi. 41) and for "blessing," and "breaking," there is a distinct suggestion of a parallel between the two occasions. In the miracle of the 4,000 (Mark vi.) this becomes clearer still, as the narrative is more condensed, formal, and liturgical. It seems possible that these occasions (or occasion, if, as Bishop Headlam and some writers think, they are not to be regarded as separate occasions) were not only steps towards the culminating episode in the Upper Chamber, but that while the Last Supper was in early days normally the central embodiment of Eucharistic

* Yet *The Guardian*, November 16, 1923, in reviewing Dr. Dearmer's *The Church at Prayer*, says: "Few are aware that a fresco has been discovered in the Catacomb of Priscilla representing a Eucharist of the first quarter of the second century." But this is a matter which at present must be regarded as far from being settled.

ideas, it was not the only one, and that the association of Eucharistic teaching with the miracle of feeding, which we find in the Fourth Gospel, was not initiated by its author (*cf.* C. H. Dodd, *Expositor*, December, 1911, "Eucharistic Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel"; and Wright, *New Testament Problems*, "The Eucharist before the Passover"). Dr. Edwin Abbott, in "Miracles of Feeding" in his *Diatessarica*, makes a suggestive case for the institution of an Agape or Eucharist long before the Passover, the Eucharist of the Last Supper being "an outcome and climax of earlier meals." He thinks that the institution on the night of the Betrayal, consists in the symbolism of the approaching Passion being then introduced by Jesus into the old and often repeated Jewish practice of blessing of a loaf, Jesus "breathing into it a new spiritual meaning and a passionateness of His own" (p. 173). On the other hand, the Thanksgiving, Breaking of Bread, and impartation were not introduced then, but were part of the ritual of the earlier meals, which had already symbolized thanksgiving and fellowship. In this way we find traces in Mark of early Eucharistic doctrine taught by Jesus before the Institution in the Upper Room, and elaborated later by the Fourth Gospel.

CHAPTER VII

ST. PAUL AND THE INSTITUTION

WITH TWO APPENDICES ON (1) THE LUCAN TEXT, AND (2) "I RECEIVED FROM THE LORD"

NOTES ON THE SILENCE OF ST. MARK, AND ON THE DIDACHE.

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER VII

Importance of 1 Cor. xi. 23-26. The only clear New Testament statement of an institution. Also the earliest narrative of the Lord's Supper. Great need to weigh carefully this testimony. Circumstances under which the passage written. Many opponents at Corinth. No new tradition. Two problems presented. (1) What is the meaning of "from the Lord"? Does it imply a direct or indirect communication? Arguments on both sides. Reasons for latter alternative. (2) "Do this in remembrance of Me." Words twice repeated. Why not found in Synoptic record? Which is most reliable? Goguel's view. Arguments on both sides. Reliability of St. Paul. Primitive tradition about the institution. Ancient literary methods. Place of interpretation in New Testament. Difficulty of explaining silence of Synoptists. Development of Sacramental teaching in St. Paul. Caution about appeal to primitive testimony. Is the Marcan, Lucan, or Pauline the earliest tradition? Difficulty of reaching definite conclusion. Holtzmann and Harnack.

CHAPTER VII

ST. PAUL AND THE INSTITUTION

In considering 1 Cor. xi. 23-26 we get to close grips with the problem we have set out to solve. We are asking whether we can believe that Jesus Christ instituted Holy Communion and purposed its continuance after He had gone. St. Paul would not seem to have had any doubts on the matter. If we read carefully the passage above we shall feel that he appears clearly to answer "Yes." Can we accept this as sufficient, in view of the fact that it stands alone in the New Testament?* Whereas none of the other accounts contain any suggestion of a permanent character in the rite, St. Paul, after saying that he received his version of the Lord's Supper from the Lord, twice traces to that source the words "Do this in remembrance of Me." He would therefore appear to regard it distinctly as the institution of a permanent memorial, and not merely as a farewell repast, and to attribute in some sense to Jesus Himself the injunction to perpetuate the observance. No devout student of the New Testament can fail to recognize the extremely weighty nature of this testimony, or to feel that it demands most careful consideration.

* *Cf.* Appendix I. at end of this chapter explaining why St. Luke xxii. 19*b*, 20 (which appears to corroborate St. Paul), cannot be called as a conclusive witness.

Every word in this short passage ought to be minutely and reverently weighed. It is not only the earliest written of the four accounts of the Lord's Supper, penned before any of the Gospels —viz., about twenty-five years after the Crucifixion—but it has the significance of being one of the earliest records in the New Testament of any alleged utterance of Jesus.* Moreover, it is addressed to a Church in which St. Paul knew that he had many opponents who would be very ready to challenge any words which were not in accordance with the teaching of the Master as delivered by the older Apostles, a Church in which there was the party of Peter, the party of Apollos, and the so-called party of Christ. It is clear that he would carefully avoid any suspicion of inaccuracy. And he speaks of it, not only as something he had "received from the Lord," but as a tradition which he had already handed down to the Corinthians, and was not now making known for the first time. He also connects it with the night of the betrayal, suggesting that it was part of a larger Passion story which he had narrated.

Now there are two sentences in this short passage which have been much discussed.

1. Do the words "from the Lord" imply a direct revelation, or may they be taken to mean a

* The possible exceptions in St. Paul are 1 Cor. vii. 10, where the Apostle traces the advice he is giving "unto the married" to "the Lord" (*cf.* St. Matt. v. 32 and St. Mark x. 2-12), and 1 Cor. ix. 14: "Even so did the Lord ordain, that they which proclaim the Gospel should live of the Gospel." *Cf.* also 1 Thess. iv. 15: "This I say unto you by the word of the Lord."

tradition handed down by others, but having its ultimate source with the Lord? Is the latter a sufficient explanation of them? We will merely state here the bare facts of the case and the conclusion which we have reached, in company with a great majority of recent scholars, and refer the reader to the Appendix for a statement of the other view and of the arguments which have been based upon it, and of our reasons for dissenting from it. There are two different prepositions (ἀπό and παρά) used by St. Paul in various passages in his Epistles, both of which are translated by the English word "from." The former is used here, and might in itself imply either of the methods already referred to; but by comparison with other passages* we are led to conclude that St. Paul uses it here of indirect reception, and that the other preposition (παρά) is the one which he would have adopted, had he certainly intended to imply a direct revelation. We are, therefore, of opinion that St. Paul here means that he had received the institution story from Jesus Christ, but through others, even as he had received the story of the Resurrection (see 1 Cor. xv. 3, where he uses the same Greek word for "I received" that he does here). This not only strengthens the historical value of St. Paul's evidence, but a few minutes' consideration will satisfy us that a revelation here would have been superfluous, and contrary to the usual Divine method. It was

* *Cf.* Gal. i. 1, and 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1; and see Zahn, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, p. 171, and Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, second edition, p. 162, where ἀπό is said to involve a remote source.

not the making known of something hitherto unknown, but the imparting of a fact well known to several who themselves were well known to St. Paul. Moreover, it is always safest to assume a natural means where such is available, and will in itself satisfy the required conditions. St. Paul had every opportunity of learning from some of the Twelve, and they had learned from Jesus Christ. Also, it represents a formula which might easily have become stereotyped and handed down to others. But at the same time St. Paul does stress the source of his tradition. It is that source and the consequent reliability of it that he wishes to impress upon his readers. He says that the tradition which he had delivered is identical with what he had himself received, and that it can be traced up to Jesus Himself. It was apparently one of the priceless memories of the first disciples, and had become a precious record preserved in the earliest Church, and Jesus was the ultimate authority for it.

In spite, then, of the opinions we refer to in the Appendix, and without in the least overlooking St. Paul's distinct claim found elsewhere in his writings to such direct inspiration as to render him at times independent of human assistance,* we agree with Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy when he says, " Scientific scholarship rightly rejects the interpretation of 1 Cor. xi. 23 as a special revelation."†

* It is well to remember that when St. Paul elsewhere claims a special revelation, he does not disclose its contents (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii.) as he does here.

† *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 263; *cf.* also Goguel, *L'Eucharistie*, p. 100, and *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 337.

2. We come to a still more vital and difficult question, when we consider the words twice repeated by St. Paul, for which he claims the authority of Jesus, " Do this in remembrance of Me."

They occur only in St. Paul, if we are not able to substantiate them in the original text of St. Luke. They follow closely upon words about both the Bread and the Cup which St. Paul clearly attributes to Jesus, words which have their parallels in St. Mark and St. Matthew, though not identical with the reports of these Gospel writers. We have already seen the impossibility of satisfactorily harmonizing the different reports of the words used by Jesus at the Last Supper.* So we must honestly face the question not only whether we have sufficient grounds for accepting literally these particular words, but also—for this will be felt to go *pari passu* with such reasoning—for preferring St. Paul's version, either in part or as a whole to St. Mark's or St. Matthew's. Clearly each part of the record must be taken with its context, and it would appear to be false reasoning to say that certain words of St. Paul are to be accepted literally, when at the same time we put aside others in favour of some other writer.

On the other hand, if we feel that the difference between the reports prevents our attaining to a certainty as to the exact words which Jesus used, have we sufficient reason for isolating the particular sentence—the one which we are called upon to consider—and concluding " this at any rate He said " ?

In the case of the words " Do this," etc., they

* *Cf.* Chap. V.

happen to be additional words—*i.e.*, they have no parallel in the other reports, and so here the author cannot clash with any other writer. This may seem to ease the question, but in reality it does the opposite—because, as we have already stated, not only does it appear at first sight exceedingly strange that if such important words were spoken, only one of the four narratives should report them, but if we are prepared to accept them on St. Paul's authority solely, we must note that other words which he and the Synoptists both record are differently reported. Are we here equally ready to prefer the Pauline version and so to discount the Synoptists' variations? If not, it would seem special pleading to claim exactitude for him in one case and not in the other.

We are bound, *e.g.*, to face the choice between St. Paul and St. Mark in the different versions they give of the words spoken by Jesus about the Cup. St. Paul makes Jesus say, "This Cup is the New Covenant in My Blood." St. Mark's version is, "This is My Blood of the Covenant, which is shed for many." St. Matthew adds "for the remission of sins." The difference is not great, nor is the meaning much affected, but we are driven to choose. And the result is that just as we feel that St. Matthew has added one short clause, so we feel that St. Paul has altered the more primitive form of St. Mark, to teach his own more explicit theology. For him Christianity is a New Covenant, inaugurated by Christ's death, as compared with the Old Covenant.

But if we are driven thus to discriminate with regard to this sentence, what is to prevent our

applying the same discrimination to the one under consideration? We must be consistent, and ask those who insist upon regarding one sentence as literally correct, because it is part of Holy Scripture, to be prepared to apply the same rule to every other sentence. We should then arrive at the conclusion that although two sets of words, said to have been spoken at the same moment, are clearly different from one another, both are equally correct. On the other hand, if we allow that either Mark or Paul may be inaccurate in any of the words they report, we must allow the possibility of a similar inaccuracy elsewhere. If we prefer St. Mark's account about the Cup, and incline to think that St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 25*a* (*cf.* above) is the less reliable of the two, can we, without special pleading, insist that he is exactly correct in verse 25*b*?*

In reading the New Testament it is well to

* The verse in our Revised Version runs: "In like manner also the Cup, after supper, saying, This Cup is the New Covenant in My Blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me." My argument is not that because we feel we ought to correct the first half, that therefore the second is necessarily unreliable—that must be tested in other ways—but that we cannot consistently apply a different standard. I feel an apology is due to some of my readers for labouring this point so fully, but it is well to remember that there are very many who still hold the doctrine of verbal inspiration, instead of the higher one adopted in this book, and that they are by no means confined to any one branch of the Church. The Roman branch has recently solemnly affirmed it. An acute controversy is going on in the United States. It has caused a lamentable split in one of our most respected Anglican missionary societies. Large bodies of Protestant Nonconformists are tied to it. The view I have adopted is, I believe, a Christian rather than a Rabbinic doctrine of inspiration, held by Jesus, taught by the Holy Spirit and the best teachers in the Church,

remember that a clear duty is laid upon us to use every faculty God has given us to discriminate, whether we are to regard the words of Christ, as found there, as words which actually fell from His lips, or as words which have in a greater or less degree been coloured by the belief and practice of the reporter or of the early Church. We have recently been reminded that "Seldom, indeed, can we venture to say, 'Here we have a precise and exact representation of what the Lord actually said.' "*

Again, Professor Swete reminds us that the Gospel record of our Lord's teaching "has come to us through processes of oral tradition and documentary compilation which leave us in doubt whether we have in any instance an exact reproduction of the Teacher's words. Even if we could reconstruct Q, or be sure that we have in St. Mark a faithful interpretation of St. Peter's reminiscences, we should not have reached the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus.† It is almost always possible to press the minuter details of the teaching too far; we may be insisting on the form which a disciple has given to the sayings of the Lord rather

---

and in accordance with facts. It seems necessary, if the enquiry we are making is to be honestly treated, to bring it to an issue on a point like this. The letter of Scripture must be made "a means of access to the eternal spirit, and as such subordinate." I believe that one great endeavour of Jesus, as well as of Paul, was to secure this subordination, and that we have them with us in the course we are following.

* Bishop Chase in *Cambridge Essays*, p. 387, 1905.

† *Cf.* "If we want to know what Jesus really said, we must go behind our Gospels to their sources" (Weinel, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, p. 44).

than on His own words. But the supreme importance of the teaching does not lie in the details, and no deduction which can reasonably be made on this score will affect its value as a whole."* It follows that we are precluded from resting any important doctrine upon a literal interpretation of some isolated saying of Jesus.

To admit the truth of such statements may seem at first to some people almost overwhelmingly grievous, and it is allowable to feel that if we might look for assurance anywhere, we might probably expect it most of all in the story we are considering. Yet on reflection we can see that God can equally well convey His meaning in either or in both of the ways indicated, and that one is as real or as God-sent a message as the other. And since we believe that Jesus went on working in His Church on earth after He had disappeared from human sight, we shall feel that there is the less need to draw a definite line of demarcation, and that what He did not say on earth, He may have said from heaven, to and through His listening disciples, by the inward utterances of His Holy Spirit. So even if words apparently attributed to Jesus were not actually spoken by Him exactly as they stand, they may still perfectly well convey His meaning and His teaching. As we have stated earlier, there is at present a great hesitation among scholars as to the words "Do this," etc., reported by St. Paul. One of the latest and fullest investigators of the matter writes thus:

"Luke, after the saying about the Cup, Paul,

* *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 551.

after the two actions of the Supper, reports a command to repeat, which Jesus gave; there can be no doubt that this command has been introduced under the influence of the conviction that it was in obedience to Christ that the Supper was celebrated. If it is easy, in reality, to understand how this command could be introduced into a text which did not contain it at first, one cannot explain how, if it was part of the original tradition, it could have disappeared from the texts of Matthew or Mark."*

"The order of repetition which Luke and Paul put into the mouth of Jesus cannot be regarded as authentic."†

Among others who have maintained that the earliest tradition knew nothing of a Sacrament to be continued, we would mention Paulus (who first enunciated the view), Dr. E. A. Abbot, P. Gardner, Grafe, Jülicher, Mensinga, Pfleiderer, Spitta, Titius, B. Weiss,‡ Wittichen, and we ought to add Luther himself§ (though in a modified way) and R. W. Emerson, who, in resigning his pastorate, declared that while he accepted the Biblical accounts, he "could not believe that Jesus meant to impose a memorial feast upon the whole world, but that the observance of the Supper as an ordinance rests

* Goguel, *L'Eucharistie*, p. 82, where a summary of divergent opinions will be found.

† *Idem*, p. 101.

‡ B. Weiss agrees with Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 123, that the observance is due to after-resurrection directions from Jesus (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 498, n. 614).

§ *Luther's Primary Works* (London, 1896), p. 309, and *cf.* Holtzmann, *Neutestamentlich Theologie*, i. 304, n. 3.

upon the questionable authority of St. Paul"* (*Works*, xi. 10, 19, 20, 29).

Among German scholars who have taken the opposite view, we may mention Holtzmann, Von Dobschütz, Wendt, Weitzsäcker, etc., while Harnack's comment is: "The words of 1 Cor. xi. 23 are too strong for me."†

Let us, as far as we can, weigh the arguments for and against. For accepting St. Paul's version we may urge—

(1) The claims St. Paul has upon us as an absolutely trustworthy witness. If we are to allow a doubt about the passage, we must be able first to satisfy ourselves that St. Paul's veracity is not thereby in any possible way called in question. No one who has any real acquaintance with his writings could entertain such a thought for a moment. We recall the horror he expresses in 1 Cor. xv. 15 at the idea of being considered a false witness about the Resurrection. We recall again his denunciation of double-dealing and craft, and of "handling the word of God deceitfully" (2 Cor. iv. 2). To imagine that for any cause whatever St. Paul would deceive his converts is monstrous and unthinkable. To this we may add

* Emerson is quoted here because his attitude in this matter is not seldom referred to and even regarded as of importance. This is really far from being so, for however great may be the charm of Emerson's writings, his verdict is not to be regarded as that of a theologian or critic, nor even of an accurate or careful scholar. Lord Morley has shown that there is perhaps no recent writer of eminence who is more open to the charge of loose and inconsistent thinking than Emerson.

† *Hist. of Dogma*, Eng. tr., i. 66, n. 1.

that scholars are in general agreement that the passage under discussion is a genuine portion of the Epistle.*

(2) It has been the constant belief of the Church, from the very earliest days, both in Jewish and Gentile lands, not only that Holy Communion was instituted by Jesus Christ, but that these special words of institution were used, and this belief was soon incorporated into her Liturgies and her history. We have already seen that St. Paul was not introducing anything new, when a few years after the death of Christ he wrote on this subject to the Church of Corinth, but was reminding them of a tradition already handed down. It was a tradition which was already prevalent, and seems early to have become so in Churches of so-called Petrine origin and sympathy, as well as in those loyal to St. Paul, in Palestine, Asia, Africa, and Rome.

Let us next summarize the reply of the critic who declines to accept the words as coming from the lips of Jesus (we purposely here omit the arguments already adduced, though they must, of course, have proper weight):

(1) There is absolutely no idea of challenging the *bona fides* of the Apostle, but only of regarding his testimony as interpretation rather than exact quotation.† However the tradition reached St. Paul, and in whatsoever sense he used the words,

* D. Volter d'Amsterdam, *Paulus*, pp. 32, 39 *f.*, is an exception, but he has very few supporters.

† A parallel may be found by comparing St. Mark v. 30 and St. Luke viii. 46. In one Gospel we have in the form of a quotation from our Lord, what in the other is part of the narrative.

we have no manner of doubt that he felt certain that he was announcing truth to the Corinthians. But in a consideration of this nature, we must beware of applying a mechanical process which was never intended. It is well to recall here again the freedom with which ancient writers often put into the mouths of their heroes words expressing sometimes their own, sometimes what they regarded as their heroes' point of view.* That literary device is familiar to students of both the Old and New Testaments. It abounds also in secular literature. In old days it was not regarded as in any way questionable. It would be a great mistake to judge such practices by our present canons of literary morality. It is clear that examples of such methods are to be found in the Synoptists, and that they abound in the Fourth Gospel. As the sentence we are dealing with happens to provide us with one of the very few apparent quotations from our Lord in St. Paul's Epistles, we have but little material for comparison, but the other passages already quoted on p. 98 of this chapter bear out in a remarkable way our present contention. They are by no means exact quotations.

Nor does St. Paul in any way cultivate strict accuracy in his quotations from the Old Testament.

* *Cf.* Chap. III., where this habit has been dealt with, and the following words: "For the Greek, history was a work of art, written for edification, not merely a bald record of facts. The Greek historian invented speeches for his principal characters. . . . Thucydides, the most conscientious historian in antiquity, habitually used this device, and candidly explains his methods" (Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, i., p. 208).

We can, therefore, at once dismiss any idea that we may be charged with dishonouring the Apostle's claim for truthfulness.

(2) We have already discussed the relative value of the reports as found in St. Paul and St. Mark, and so need only say here that we must be very careful, lest in defending one reputation we neglect another. We have seen that to many critics the chief difficulty in accepting St. Paul's version is that St. Mark and St. Matthew omit the facts. Schmiedel feels this so strongly that he says: "Matthew and Mark would not dare to omit such words, and therefore they were never spoken, but were gradually evolved by the disciples." This may seem too sweeping, for not only is it dangerous to argue from the silence of the Gospels,* but also it may fairly be replied that Mark, who had been a companion of Paul and Luke in Paul's first imprisonment in Rome, gives an account of the event which is in general harmony with St. Paul's, and that considering the very fragmentary and compressed records that we have, it is not altogether unintelligible that a particular sentence should have been omitted.

(3) It is felt that there is a very clear development of Sacramental teaching in St. Paul's Epistles, as compared with the simple truths enunciated by Jesus Himself. This is not the place to discuss whether this is a legitimate evolution of doctrine or not,† but the fact itself is sufficiently evident to suggest that the words we are considering may well be regarded as going *pari passu* with this ex-

* *Cf.* note at close of chap. on The Silence of St. Mark.

† See Chap. VIII., where this is considered.

pansion, and as sharing with it in the element of interpretation.

(4) The statement (2) on p. 108 on behalf of accepting the words, because of their early incorporation into our Liturgies, would be challenged as specious but misleading—*e.g.*, the witness of Justin Martyr is often appealed to as supporting the words in question. Justin says: "The Apostles in memoirs produced by them, which are called Gospels, related that when Jesus had taken bread and given thanks, He then commanded them and said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.'"*

Now it is obviously unfair to appeal to this as independent testimony, as Justin is no doubt finding his authority for this statement in the tradition preserved by the Church and resting largely upon St. Paul and St. Luke, while on the other hand Justin's own description of the Eucharist in his time, and his theological interpretations of it, show a further development, and agree rather with the teaching of Ignatius and the Fourth Gospel than with St. Paul. But this is beyond our limits, and is only referred to to indicate a still further line of tradition, and the point at which the gradual evolution of the Eucharist becomes stabilized. Any appeal to the early Liturgies is, for the same reason, ruled out, because while the words of Bishop Westcott are, of course, true, "There is no evidence of the power or reality of a belief less open to suspicion than what is derived from public services, which are contemporaneous, and are uninterruptedly perpetuated," these conditions do not obtain here,

* Justin Martyr, *First Apol.*, c. 65.

and the very earliest Liturgy we possess is of considerably later date. It is not questioned that the tradition in favour of the words, "Do this," etc., is exceedingly early, and practically universal when once established; the only doubt is whether it is the primitive tradition or was added somewhat later. Many scholars seem to lean to the Marcan shorter tradition, and to arrive at that conclusion by the application of processes of analysis and criticism, which have been elaborated and applied by modern scholars to this and other ancient literature. Dean Rashdall holds that St. Paul's attitude cannot be regarded as final, or as superior to what may be supposed to come from Q or Mark, since tradition, when put into writing later, may obviously be more primitive than one written down earlier. He thinks, therefore, that St. Mark may represent an earlier tradition than St. Paul, and that the shorter form of St. Luke may be earlier than either.*

Possibly we shall never be able to get much more certainty than can be attained by the reverent weighing of the above and like considerations, and each student must settle the question for himself. There will always be those who will consider St. Paul's statement sufficient evidence, and will interpret his words quite literally. They will have to allow that the words themselves have not in any case the same amount of historical attestation that attaches to the sentence: "This is My Body," which is found in all four accounts.

Other equally devoted students of the mind and methods of the Master will hold that it is

* Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement*, etc., pp. 41-44.

in perfect harmony with His usual method of teaching, if He did not actually utter the words at all, but left His disciples to interpret for themselves, by the light of the Holy Spirit's teaching, the significance of His actions in the Upper Room, and, after He was gone, to make such response as their love moved them to do. We must remember that there are many different ways of speaking—apart from human language. An attitude, a tone, an expression of the countenance may speak, and often more loudly than words. Jesus had often broken bread with His disciples previously. There is surely a distinct connection between this occasion and such occasions as St. Mark vi. 41, viii. 6, viii. 19,* and we cannot read the story of the Supper at Emmaus (St. Luke xxiv. 30, 34), where the participants with Jesus were not members of the Twelve, but only disciples, without realizing that there was something distinctive and arresting about our Lord's peculiar way of "blessing" and "breaking bread" which had already impressed itself upon these two. So the Eucharist has its antecedents and preparations beforehand, as well as its subsequent celebrations. We can all see that St. Paul might be uttering a great truth, even if Jesus never actually spoke the words under discussion. God at times writes in shorthand, or in invisible ink, and leaves men to decipher and interpret His writing.

* "No less than six different versions of the Feeding of the Multitude are incorporated, each dwelling minutely on the whole procedure . . . the breaking and blessing of the food by the presiding officer" (B. W. Bacon, *The Founding of the Church*, p. 84).

The point is not so much, were the actual words spoken, but did the disciples fulfil the intentions, or even the good pleasure of their Master, in repeating the rite, and was their action guided by the Spirit of Truth? When, in spite of the controversies and discussions which have gathered around the sacred rite, we recall the position it has filled in the Christian life, we can hardly hesitate about the reply; moreover, most Christians will agree that the words we are considering, whether we believe them to have been spoken on the occasion, or regard them as a summary of what was in our Lord's mind,* do in a wonderful way represent His intentions, and most of us may feel disposed to concur in the verdict of the cautious Holtzmann, who says, "The words, 'Do this in remembrance of Me' perhaps were never spoken, but only the more surely do they utter what lay in the occasion and made itself current with unforced correctness of sequence" (*New Testament Theol.*, i. 304).

* Box thinks St. Paul is quoting from some liturgical form already current, and that this accounts for the stereotyped language used, unlike his usual style (*J. of Th. Studies*, April, 1902).

Dr. Nairne says: "The addition 'Do this in remembrance of Me" seems to have been made by the Church for its liturgical re-enactment of the rite. The Lord's words have been preserved in the Gospel: His meaning and intention have been brought out by the worshippers. As so often, the written letters guard past history, the Spirit in them interprets the future" (*The Faith of the New Testament*, pp. 77-78).

APPENDICES

Appendix I: St. Luke xxii. 14-20.—One of the chief problems connected with the Eucharist is the account of the event in the Third Gospel. (It, like other features in this subject, would seem to be among "the hidden things which belong" not to scholars, but "to the Lord our God." In this it reminds one of the conflicting conclusions explorers have come to as to the site of the Holy Sepulchre. Perhaps there is spiritual and moral gain in such things being veiled in mystery.) Such scholars as Resch, Holtzmann, Schweitzer, Goguel, Battiffol, Loisy, Anderson, are by no means agreed in their views about the matter. At any rate, since Westcott and Hort put verses 19*b*-20 in brackets in their Greek text, regarding them, on the ground of their omission in some early Western authorities, as a later insertion, scholars have not felt much confidence in summoning St. Luke as an independent witness of an institution by Christ. In *H.D.B.*, art. "Jesus Christ," Dr. Sanday traces from the ancient manuscripts and versions the gradual alteration of the text. There can be no doubt that verses 19*b*-20 are omitted in what is commonly regarded as the oldest form of the Western text (D. a. ff.^{2} i. l.). Then the order of verses 17, 18, and 19*a*, became transposed, so as to make the sequence of the Bread and Cup correspond to the other narratives (b, e). Then the words relating to the Bread were supplemented from 1 Cor. xi. 24 (Cur.). Then the part relating to the Cup was also supplemented by a somewhat free interpretation partly suggested by Matthew and Mark, but mainly from 1 Cor. xi. 25 (Sin.). Thus the primitive form of the Western text is shorter, and transposes the order of the Bread and Cup (*cf.* 1 Cor. x. 16 and the *Didache* 9), and omits all mention of the second Cup, while the great mass of Greek manuscripts and other authorities introduce a second Cup or a second mention of a Cup, and fill out mainly from 1 Cor. xi. It is clear that both these types of text existed in the second century, and either may be the original. It is one of the cases where the internal evidence is strongly in favour of what is called the Western text. There was always a greater temptation to expand than to contract, and the double mention of the Cup would raise a difficulty, and may account for an interpolation.

But the resultant text is very difficult, and the problem seems still unsolved. It has been suggested that Westcott and Hort's

text represents a transition between two types of text, the one containing only verses 15-18, the other like the *textus receptus* of Luke as found in our E.V. If this were so, the whole of verse 19 would be interpolated from St. Paul, and St. Luke, like the Fourth Gospel, would have no account of the institution of the rite.* But there is no manuscript authority for omitting verse 19*a*. On the supposition that the *textus receptus* of St. Luke is the original one, alterations would be accounted for by the difficulty which the mention of two Cups occasions.†

Amidst so much which is uncertain, it is satisfactory to be reminded by Dr. Sanday that though we cannot quote St. Luke as confirming the command of Jesus to repeat the rite, yet the introduction of that command into St. Luke's account, even if it be an interpolation—must have taken place so early, in order to obtain the currency it possessed, that it is a recognition of the fact itself and of its acceptance at the headquarters of the Church, which may be regarded as even stronger testimony of the current belief and practice than the statement of any single writer could be, even though the writer were an Evangelist.‡ Although the text of St. Luke is too uncertain to be called in witness for the fact of an institution, there are not a few modern scholars (over and above those who feel inclined to apply to this case Hort's words when he bids us "Remember that not everything that is doubted is really doubtful") who accept the longer version as original. Dr. W. Morgan§ thinks "the evidence for the authenticity of the longer text is overwhelmingly strong," and regards verses 15-17 as not being an account of the rite itself, but an introduction to it; but, on the other hand, he regards St. Luke as dependent for the tradition either on 1 Cor. xi. or on the usage of the Christian Churches, and so he sets aside the Third Gospel as not being an independent source, and says we are left with only two primary sources, St. Mark and St. Paul. Dr. Salmon accepts the disputed words, saying: "The evidence is overwhelming, the Eastern testimony being unanimous,

* Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, p. 179 *f*.

† *Ency. of Rel. and Ethics*, p. 540.

‡ *Cf. H.D.B.*, art. "Jesus Christ," p. 636.

§ *The Religion and Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 216-217. On p. 218 he says: "The command to repeat the act is improbable." See also Nestle, *Textl. Crit. of Greek Test.*, p. 276 *f*.; Zahn, *Einl. in d. N.T.*, ii. 357 *ff*.; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 496.

the Western being divided. A text which omitted the words obtained currency in the West. . . . Omission leaves a gaping wound, the Bread is declared to be the Lord's Body, but the Cup is not connected with His Blood. That St. Luke should have so differed from the previous Evangelists is chronologically inexplicable. . . . How can St. Luke represent a view not held by the Evangelists before him, or by the Church after him?" *Cf. Human Element in the Gospels*, pp. 490-493. The whole case of St. Luke's text is fully stated in *The New Testament in Greek*, by Westcott and Hort, Introduction and Appendix, 1896, pp. 63-64; and on p. 146 is a note by Professor Burkitt on Syriac Manuscripts. On pp. 63 and 64 is a long note by Hort on St. Luke xxii. 19-20, discussing various possible motives and explanations, and concluding: "These difficulties, added to the suspicious coincidence with 1 Cor. xi. 24 and the transcriptional evidence given above leave no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of Luke notwithstanding the purely Western ancestry of the documents which omit them."

Appendix II: "I Received from the Lord."—ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου. Those who have interpreted St. Paul's phrase, "I received from the Lord," as implying a direct revelation, have allowed themselves to be led into making startling suggestions—*e.g.*, Dr. Percy Gardner, who goes so far as to say that this interpretation "seems certain," in 1893* declared that either (1) the Synoptists antedate by nearly a quarter of a century the scene of breaking bread, and that Jesus did not say, "This is My Body," but St. Paul in a trance heard the words; or (2) Jesus did break bread, and give it, but no more. Therefore, no Sacrament was instituted till Paul in vision beheld the scene repeated, and heard the new command, "This do," etc. Then he instituted the Eucharist in imitation of the Eleusinian mysteries by which he was impressed. Later, in *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, Dr. Gardner modifies these views, but he holds to the belief that St. Paul regarded his own version of the event as a direct revelation of his Master in heaven, and stresses

* *Cf. The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, p. 5, and *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 955, and chaps. xxvi. and xxxvi., where this view is modified; and this is further modified in a chap. on Faith and Sacraments in *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, 102-126.

the "I" ("I delivered unto you") and the ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου (from the Lord).

Godet (*Com. sur I. Ep. aux Cor.*, ii., pp. 161 *f.*, Neuchâtel, 1886-1887) and Loisy (*Ev. Syn.*, ii., p. 532, n. 1) adopt also the idea of a special revelation; and Bousset thinks that in a vision Paul saw Jesus at table with His disciples (*Schr.* ii. 1, p. 111). In *The Gospel of the Holy Communion*, Dr. Macleod of Govan comments most helpfully and devotionally on what he regards as a reinstitution by the Risen Lord now fulfilling His priestly work in heaven. Moreover, this or similar views are by no means without their present upholders.

In *The Beginnings of Christianity* Drs. Foakes Jackson and Lake make the development of Christianity in Corinth responsible for the whole sacramental development of the early Church, and teach that when St. Paul says he had received the Christian traditions "from the Lord," he had really "imagined it himself, and that because of the mysteries celebrated at Corinth." Surely this is to reverse the historical method, for the Christian Sacraments are obviously older than the Corinthian Epistle (*cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 23); but then, according to the last quoted writers, "A nearer approach to truth is always (*sic*) a departure from orthodoxy"! It is obvious that the opinions here expressed are by no means a necessary deduction from the phrase St. Paul used, even if he had intended to claim a special revelation. We think that sufficient reasons have been already given for not adopting this line of interpretation. St. Paul's answer to any assertion that he and not Jesus was the author of the Holy Communion, or, "as some confidently affirm," even of Christianity itself, would be "I delivered unto you, that which also I received" (1 Cor. xv. 3), and "I received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you" (1 Cor. xi. 23).

NOTE ON THE SILENCE OF ST. MARK

A good deal of stress has been laid by some critics upon the silence of St. Mark with regard to any intention of Jesus for the future of the rite narrated in xiv. 22-25. This is often adduced as a strong piece of negative evidence. How much weight may we attach to this silence, and how far can it be regarded as sufficient to counterbalance the widespread and generally accepted tradition spoken of in 1 Cor. xi., many years before St. Mark wrote his Gospel, and

wholeheartedly accepted by St. Paul himself and the early Church? We have quite satisfactory reasons for regarding St. Mark's Gospel as a reliable historical record,* but besides the well-known risks of relying upon the *argumentum e silentio*, doing which has led students into strange and disastrous paths, we have to consider certain factors peculiar to the Second Gospel, which should bid us be very careful in this instance.

While regarding St. Mark's Gospel as reliable and graphic, it is evidently not complete.† This can be abundantly illustrated; we have only to recall its beginning and its ending to see what wide gaps exist. In Matthew and Luke we see how the Gospel developed, how it came to include a birth story, how it emphasized more the teaching work of Jesus, and how the story of the Resurrection could be told with a fullness which St. Mark does not attempt. So far as the narrative of the Last Supper is concerned, it is impossible to get behind Mark's account, or to say whether any record he used contained information beyond that which he gives. On the other hand, it is extremely difficult to believe that St. Mark, who had been a friend and companion both of St. Paul and St. Peter, could have been ignorant of the tradition referred to by the former in 1 Cor. xi., and which quite probably, in part at least, was derived from St. Peter, (*cf.* p. 100) whose interpreter‡ Mark was said to be. It is far more reasonable to think that Jesus had already previously taught the disciples to find in the solemn

---

* For this *cf.* Dr. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, and Dr. Swete, *St. Mark*, and the books referred to for reliability of the Gospels, in Chap. IV., p. 42.

† Dr. Nairne, in *The Faith of the New Testament*, pp. 6-24, illustrates this characteristic again and again. *Cf.* p. 7, "Much is wanting in Mark, which the other Gospels have," etc.; p. 14, concerning "the reticence" about the Resurrection, and the "reticence and mystery" about the person of Jesus; p. 16, "In Mark there is little teaching"; p. 18, concerning St. Mark's concentration upon certain points in the narrative of the Last Supper; p. 19, "limitations and immensities"; p. 22, "We must quite honestly recognize these limits"; p. 26, "It is by itself an imperfect Gospel," with "the pregnant imperfection of a sketch."

‡ Papias's expression (Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39), and *cf.* Nairne, *sub loc.*, p. 28.

breaking of bread a religious rite, and that, in consequence, the Lord's Supper was not in itself the institution of a new rite, but only a new meaning attached to an old rite, and that therefore there was no need for St. Mark to say anything about its continuance.*

To find more significance than this is to assume that the New Testament contains a complete record of the primitive Gospel, whereas it only offers a partial reflection of the Church life from which and for which it originated. The New Testament may fail to mention this or that belief or practice, but this silence is no argument against the existence of such belief or practice, except on the unfair assumption that we have in the New Testament a complete and coherent record of the original Gospel of Jesus.†

Hence it is to the tradition of the Church that we have again and again to appeal, and the tradition seems here quite too strong to be outweighed by any silence of St. Mark. Such explicit testimony, coupled with the unvarying belief of the Church from the earliest ages, requires more than silence to gainsay it.

As we are considering this particular instance of silence, it may be well to carry the enquiry further, and to see what absurd and misleading results might be reached, and have, indeed, already been reached by some, if in the case of the Lord's Supper we allowed the silence of any one of the writers to be accepted as valid evidence against the statements of other writers or of well authenticated tradition.

1. St. Luke, according to the text adopted by most scholars, is not only silent as to any future of the rite, but reverses the order of the bread and wine, thus disarranging the accepted order. St. Paul adopts the same order in 1 Cor. x., and the Didache does the same.‡ Some have regarded this want of testimony to the

---

* Dr. W. Morgan, in the *Religion and Theol. of St. Paul*, suggests that "perhaps the saying of Mark is preserved in a truncated form, and the meaning is regarded as self-evident."

† *Cf.* Moffatt, *Theology of Gospels*, pp. 188-189.

‡ *Cf.* Note on Didache which follows this Note. For a possible explanation of the order in St. Luke, *cf.* Goguel, p. 144, and Salmon, *The Human Elements in the Gospels*, pp. 492 *f.* It has been suggested that possibly a certain amount of freedom was at first used even with regard to the order. Certainly there would be no idea of enslaving the spirit by a wooden repetition of sacred words

usual order as discrediting that order, but most scholars are content to accept the weightier evidence of the first two Gospels, and of 1 Cor. xi., and of the tradition usual in the Church. Also St. Luke must have been well acquainted with St. Mark's account and with St. Paul's practice.

2. The Fourth Gospel goes further than any of the other Evangelists in this direction and omits the Lord's Supper entirely, though giving a longer account of events in the Upper Chamber than any others. Some have held that this silence very seriously challenges the credibility of the Synoptists and St. Paul. In Chapter VI. we have given what seem to us satisfactory reasons for the silence of the Fourth Gospel, and we there reach a quite different conclusion.

3. *The Acts of the Apostles.*—Critics have argued that the term "breaking of bread," omitting all mention of a cup or of drinking, implies by this silence the absence of the latter, and removes any reference to the Sacrament. But this would be a very dangerous use of the *argumentum e silentio.* In the first place, the author of the Acts had no occasion to speak of ideas which Christians associated with the breaking of bread, nor is he attempting to give full details, therefore his silence would be worthless as negative evidence. Also, no cup is mentioned at Troas, and Troas was a Pauline Church, where the habit could hardly differ from other Pauline Churches. There is every reason for believing that the term "breaking of bread" included both eating and drinking. It goes without saying that in the thirsty East eating was always accompanied by drinking.

4. *The Pauline Epistles.*—Only in one Epistle (1 Cor.), out of the thirteen ascribed to St. Paul, do we find any clear reference to Holy Communion. It has been argued that the silence in the other twelve reveals an absence of the custom in the Churches addressed, and indicates the small importance St. Paul attached to the matter. Yet the language in 1 Cor. xi., compared with Rom. vi. 17, and St. Paul's assumption of a common ground of Christian belief and a common tradition accepted by all ("as I teach everywhere in every Church," 1 Cor. iv. 17), disposes of

---

or order of sacred actions. We know also that some ascetic circles substituted water for wine in early days, and there are not lacking signs which attest some flexibility and freedom, as against too rigid routine.

this objection, and satisfactorily explains why a matter generally recognized did not call for any special treatment.*

5. *Other New Testament Books.*—The same argument may be applied to other New Testament books, whose silence is at times urged.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that the fragmentary character of our New Testament Literature explains the silence we find on this and other subjects and suggests our supplementing such both from the tradition and habits of early Christianity and by a reasonable exercise of common sense. It has already been mentioned (Chap. I.) that had 1 Cor. been lost, we should most mistakenly have gathered from the silence of the New Testament that no tradition existed at the beginning as to Holy Communion being a bequest from Jesus, and we should have found it extraordinarily difficult to explain the practically universal belief and custom of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Church. Yet it is quite evident that this argument from silence in the New Testament would have been most misleading. It seems abundantly clear that the silence of St. Mark in this particular is not capable of bearing all the weight often put upon it.

We may conclude with some words from Sir W. Ramsay:

"There is a strong tendency to abbreviate. Even the longest account is, indubitably, far shorter than the actual incident. . . It is supremely unmethodical to argue that because certain words or details are omitted in any source, therefore the original authority from whom the source was derived was ignorant of them."†

---

* Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung*, i., p. 175, urges strongly that the account of the Last Supper in St. Paul "belonged to the oldest element of the tradition as Paul had received it in Damascus." He produced it as a "fest formulierte Tradition." "He received it" from the Lord "in the same sense that he received the Gospel as a whole. . . . His information came naturally from his period of instruction in Damascus, completed through his intercourse with Peter and James in Jerusalem. Therefore, it cannot be plausibly suggested that he here (1 Cor. xi) offers a special tradition about the Lord's Supper differing from the general tradition."

† *Expository Times*, March, 1910. This warning is not necessarily contradictory of the statement about the "temptation to expand," on p. 115.

NOTE ON THE DIDACHE

Our study does not comprise, except incidentally, any writings outside the New Testament. The date of the Didache is still under discussion. That and its local origin render its witness doubtful. It probably shows a community in which the doctrine of the Eucharist had not developed on Pauline lines. It contains no clear reference to the connection of the meal with the Lord's Supper. Further information can be found in *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, art. "Lord's Supper," 6 (c); and V. Bartlet, "Didache," in *H.D.B.*, extra vol., 439 *ff.*; and Drews in *Neutest. Apokryphen*, 182-188, and in the Dean of Wells's recent book *Barnabas, Hermas and The Didache*.

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTER VII

Many writers have been referred to in the text or footnotes of this chapter. All writers on the origin of Holy Communion or on 1 Cor. deal with the subject. In addition to those referred to, the following may be added:

D. of Christ and the Gospels, art. "Lord's Supper" (R. F. Falconer).

H.D. of Bible, art. "Lord's Supper" (Dr. Plummer).

D. of Ap. Ch., art. "Eucharist" (G. H. Clayton).

E.R.E., art. "Eucharist to end of Middle Ages" (J. A. Srawley).

F.Bi., art. "Eucharist" (J. A. Robinson).

P.R.E.[3] art. "Abendmahl" (Cremer and Loofs).

F. Spitta: *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums*, i., 1893.

J. A. Thayer: Recent Discussions respecting the Lord's Supper in *J.B.L.*, xviii. (1899) 110-131.

A. Schweitzer: *Das Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit dem Leben Jesu und der Geschichte der Urchristentums*, 1901.

W. B. Frankland: *The Early Eucharist*, 1902.

J. F. Bethune-Baker: *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*, 1903, pp. 393 *ff.*

J. C. Lambert: *The Sacraments in the New Testament*, 1903.

P. N. Waggett: *The Christian Doctrine of The Lord's Supper*, 1905.

CHAPTER VIII

JESUS CHRIST AND ST. PAUL

With Three Notes.

I. ON "KNOWING CHRIST AFTER THE FLESH."

II. ON TWO TREATISES ON "JESUS AND PAUL."

III. TESTIMONIES FROM GERMAN SCHOLARS.

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER VIII

Is it "Jesus and Paul" or "Jesus or Paul"? Importance of this for our enquiry: if the two are opposed, our chief authority for the institution is discredited. Views of Shaw, Loisy, Wrede. Was Paul the founder of the Christian religion based on heathen mysteries? Five reasons for the contrary view. Paul's strong individuality. He had not known Jesus in the flesh, yet was acquainted with His life. Harmony between Gospel of Jesus and "my gospel." Yet originality in latter. Paul's gospel a further stage in Christianity. Development characteristic of God's way of working. Progress in the life and teaching of Jesus. Work left for others to do. Paul's place in this task. Difference between mission of Jesus and mission of Paul. Death and Resurrection of Jesus came between the two. Preaching of the Cross. The mission of the Paraclete. The Jewish world and the Gentile world. Summary of Paul's contribution. Oneness with Christ. Mystical Christianity. "A different gospel." St. Paul's sacramental teaching derived from Jesus, and part of his own personal experience. This illustrated from both Sacraments.

Note I. On "Knowing Christ after the Flesh."

Note II. Two treatises in English on "Jesus and Paul."

Note III. Four testimonies from German scholars.

CHAPTER VIII

JESUS CHRIST AND ST. PAUL

"Jesus and Paul"; some would have to say "Jesus or Paul."* How are they related to each other? To meet the questionings raised by modern research, we have to ask how far Paul can be regarded as a trustworthy exponent of the mind and teaching of Jesus. This becomes the more urgent in the case of our own investigation, because, as we saw in our last chapter, it is to Paul alone, so far as the New Testament is concerned, that we can turn for the record of any words expressing the intention of Jesus as to the future repetition of the Lord's Supper. How far, in that particular instance, his testimony may be regarded as sufficient to establish the fact has been already discussed. In the present chapter we come face to face with a still more fundamental question, and one which lies before and behind the one we have discussed. It is admitted on all sides that we have in St. Paul's Epistles fuller teaching about the two great Christian Sacraments than we receive from Jesus. Suppose, then, that it can be proved—as some affirm—that

* Various theological books are well known in German, French, etc., under these two titles. For the sake of compression we have adopted the short form "Jesus and Paul," rather than the fuller form at the head of the chapter which on most occasions we should rightly prefer to use.

St. Paul is no true interpreter of the teaching of Jesus at all. Suppose that St. Paul's gospel can be shown to disagree with the Gospel of Jesus. This would seem once for all to discredit St. Paul as a witness, and not only would the opponents of Christianity be able to say that St. Paul's sacramental teaching is a further development of the teaching of Jesus, but that it is vitiated at its source. To set out at all adequately the relationship of St. Paul's gospel to that of Jesus would, of course, be beyond the aim and limit of this book, and it has been often done and occupies whole volumes. Only one chapter can be devoted to it here, but as no structure is stronger than its foundation, we have to ask whether this foundation stands.

We propose merely to suggest shortly certain considerations which, in our opinion, sufficiently substantiate St. Paul's loyalty to Jesus, and therefore, once for all, rebut the charges not only of men like Mr. Bernard Shaw,* but also of those who, like Loisy,† insist that Paul did not get the universal element or the economy of salvation which he

* Mr. B. Shaw does not hesitate to express his dislike for St. Paul, whom he describes as one of "many very unchristlike people trading under the name of Christ" (*St. Martin-in-the-Fields Review*, May, 1922, p. 205). *Cf.* also Renan's repugnance for the "ugly little Jew," and Nietzsche's description, "An exceedingly unpleasant person both to himself and others." Gunkel says: "Paul's influence was positively mischievous." Arnold Meyer says: "Paul has obscured the simple gospel of Jesus. He is responsible for a tremendous, momentous, distorting transformation" (*Jesus or Paul*, Eng. tr., chap. iii.).

† "We do not feel that we are required by sane criticism to surrender nearly all that M. Loisy has surrendered" (Dean Inge on "Catholic Modernism in France").

preaches from Jesus but from the pagan mysteries, and writers like Wrede, who in 1904 said: "There is no influence of the teaching of Jesus upon Paul's theology. Paul's gospel was independent of, and essentially different in character from that of Jesus. Paul lived in a wholly different world of thought and created something essentially new, which has nothing to do with the thought of Jesus, and goes far beyond the conception of primitive Christianity."* In fact, the idea has widely been adopted that Paul was the founder of the Christian religion as we know it; the inventor of a religion, which, however splendid, is a subversion of the simple Gospel preached by Jesus and therefore cannot be regarded as historically based upon the teaching of the Prophet of Nazareth. Paul took over from primitive Christianity the belief that Jesus was the Messiah, but he developed this into a practically new religion, and this, according to some writers, was done by appropriating current ideas from the mystery religions of his day. In other words, Paul's contribution was to make Christianity into a mystery religion. With this last explanation we shall deal in Chapter IX. ("St. Paul and the Mysteries"), but here we are concerned with an impartial yet brief consideration of such criticism, and so far as such limitations permit, we ought in this respect, as in the whole subject we are treating, to welcome without reserve the use of every reasonable test, and of every process of historical and literary criticism which modern scholarship or science puts within

* *Cf.* Wrede's *Paulus*, p. 167; Kabish in his *Eschatology of Paul* had earlier expressed the same views.

our reach, in asking whether we can honestly affirm that Paul truly represents Jesus, that he speaks with proper authority about Him and for Him, that he teaches with the confidence which would come of knowing that he expressed the mind of Jesus. We have to remember that most probably Paul never knew Jesus in the flesh,* while, on the other hand, he professed to have seen Him on the road to Damascus and to have been converted to Him, and henceforth to have lost himself, almost to have merged his individuality, " in Christ."

St. Paul's was a strong personality, and it throbs through his Epistles, but he is himself surcharged with the Spirit of Christ. " Christ, I am Christ's, and let the words suffice you, yea, for me too, He greatly hath sufficed."† " Henceforth, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Had he a right to say this, or was he deceiving himself, as well as his readers? For the sake of brevity we will to a great extent confine ourselves to stating certain conclusions which the result of careful study produces, and append notes indicating some of the grounds which lead us to such conclusions.

1. Paul was a man of a singularly strong individuality, full of fire, zeal, and purpose, and after the Damascus road episode his one object and end in life was to further the purposes of Jesus, Whom once he persecuted but now adored, and to Whose

* For the opposite view *cf.* J. Weiss, who devotes the greater part of his *Paulus und Jesus* to prove that Paul had seen and known Jesus in the flesh. Dr. J. H. Moulton and Sir W. M. Ramsay are of the same opinion.

† F. W. H. Myers, *St. Paul.*

chariot wheels he had now for ever bound himself as a willing slave. And to the end he never deviated from that position. From the moment of his first eager surrender, he never looked back. Henceforth, Jesus became the dynamic force and inspiration of his life.

2. Although, as we have said, he had probably never met Jesus in the flesh, there are abundant proofs that he was well acquainted with the story of His earthly life.* It has been urged against St. Paul that he seldom directly refers to particular incidents of that life, and very rarely quotes actual words of Jesus. In our last chapter we showed the danger of arguing from silence, and it is safe to assert that St. Paul's letters presuppose the Jesus of the Gospels and entirely harmonize with the character there revealed. Moreover, St. Paul deliberately limits his references to Jesus, when he speaks of having "known Christ after the flesh," and adds, "yet now we know Him so no more" (2 Cor. v. 16). This not only implies that the traditions of the earthly life of Jesus were known —otherwise the antithesis would have no point— but at the same time it affirms that the historic life of Jesus being past, and He being now known spiritually, such references as some profess to miss, would in themselves be out of place. In a note at the end of this chapter we hope to say more on this subject, but we do not think that Wernle exaggerates when he says, "Paul never knew Jesus in His

* *Cf.* Note I. at end of chapter. Paul, no doubt, owed this knowledge to the Christian community with which he had come in contact at Jerusalem.

lifetime; nevertheless, it was he who best understood Him." And again we agree that "Paul is the one whose insight into the mind of Christ has never been surpassed."* Were we not aware that Paul was not one of the original disciples of Christianity, we might well have taken him for such, because of his intuitive sense of his Master's mind and outlook, and because of his intimacy with His aims and motives. How can this be accounted for, except it be granted that, having later learnt to know Christ, "or rather to be known of Him," he so yielded himself to his Master's influence that the Spirit of Jesus had entered into him, and so Jesus had become his constant inspiration?

3. We have spoken of the essential unity between the Gospel of Jesus and what Paul calls "my gospel" (Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8). He stresses the unity, for he believed he had the authority of Jesus for it,† but we must not overlook the possessive pronoun; for there was always an independent handling of the knowledge he had acquired and a distinctive presentation of the message, as we should naturally expect from a man of his education,

* A. T. Robertson, D.D., in *Paul the Interpreter of Christ*.

† While we are bound to analyze the human aspects of Paul's teaching, we must not forget the constant stress he lays upon his independence of human help, and his firm belief that his gospel had come to him "through revelation" of Jesus Christ (Gal. i. 12; *cf.* also i. 6, 7; ii. 5, 7, 14); but careful study of the Epistle to the Galatians will lead us to differentiate between the gospel St. Paul learnt in part from, and shared with, the Twelve, and the special "gospel of the uncircumcision" of which he here speaks, and which was his peculiar possession as the Apostle of the Gentiles. *Cf.* C. A. A. Scott, *Camb. Biblical Essays*, "Jesus and Paul," pp. 338, 339.

genius, and originality. Paul was "a speculative thinker of no mean order," and "views which he did not originate, he treated in an original way."* Therefore Paul's gospel could never be a mere reiteration of the Gospel of Jesus, which, were it possible, would be in itself a complete condemnation of its character. It was, indeed, bound for many reasons to be a further and more advanced stage of the Gospel. Some of these we shall presently mention, but it is well to note that the advance we speak of, is largely accounted for by the middle stage between Jesus and Paul, the stage of primitive Christianity, which is often overlooked by critics.† Moreover, the religion of Jesus, being not a dead thing but a living power, would be always adapting itself to its new surroundings. It had no doubt already undergone certain changes in its outward form and setting when Paul appeared, and for these not Paul, but others before him, were responsible. That the Christian Gospel underwent development should not surprise us. Is not gradual development part of God's normal method of working? Is not a progressive and not a static revelation in keeping with the whole method of nature and of human life? Is it not exemplified in the Person as well as in the teaching of Jesus Himself? May we not find in the unfolding of His human life here on earth an illustration of this Divine law? This particular illustration of the truth which we are considering, if we only had space for it, would in itself

* The quotations are from Peake's *Quintessence of Paulinism*.

† This is pointed out by Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, and by Harnack, *History of Dogma* (ed. 1909).

offer a fascinating field for study. As it is, we can only suggest that the Synoptists certainly seem to witness to the development of Jesus Himself, both in His own spiritual life and in His deepening insight into the work entrusted to Him, as well as in the message He delivered to others. He did not stand still any more than Paul or others stood still. To say that the teaching which Jesus imparted to His disciples was also progressive is only to state what is true of any great teacher. He gradually made known to them new truths and new lessons with new revelations concerning Himself and His mission, as they were able to bear them (St. John xvi. 12); and He spoke of " many things yet to say " (*ibid.*), when Pentecost should have come and barriers should have fallen.* Some of these He would afterwards speak by a Paul or a John or other teachers, thus fulfilling His mission in and through the Church.† In that way we understand how to Paul would fall the task of unfolding the lessons of the past and initiating fresh teaching for the present and the future.

The disparity we note between the simple Christianity of the Synoptic Gospels and its more developed form in St. Paul, between the Gospel of Jesus and the gospel about Jesus, finds its double

* *Cf.* also our Lord's constant references to His time not yet having arrived.

† *Cf.* Ephesians i. 23, which Origen, Chrysostom, and Latin versions interpret to mean " the fulness (or fulfilment) of Him who all in all is being filled (or fulfilled)." *Cf.* J. A. Robinson, *Epistle to Ephesians*, pp. 255 *f.* Thus the Church continues the work of the Incarnation, and Christ reproduces, expresses, realizes Himself in and through the Church.

explanation in the growing needs of the Church of the Apostolic age and the growing experience of St. Paul himself. The Christology of the Apostolic Church and of St. Paul is the completion of the Christology of the first three Gospels. In them we find the narrative, in St. Paul we find the interpretation. But the latter can be shown to be the natural outcome of the teaching of Jesus, and to represent the necessary implications of His Life, Death, and Resurrection. In St. Paul himself development is a marked feature. We see it at work as he progresses from the concrete to the abstract, from experience to principles, from life into the realms of ideas, and we find all this intensified by his later experience and by the conditions of his mission.

The fact of development in itself is natural, and unless it can be proved that the development is not in true accord with the teaching of Jesus, it substantiates rather than contradicts the intimate connection between Jesus and Paul.

4. We must, of course, allow for the entirely different circumstances and surroundings of Paul's life as compared with that of Jesus. The one had a mission which for the time of His earthly sojourn was definitely confined "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," the other was a missionary to the Gentiles, and for a large part of his work had no Jewish foundation of belief to build upon. It would indeed be strange if his gospel could be uttered in tones reproducing exactly those of Jesus. Jesus also, by the very necessity of His Being and the conditions of His Ministry, was One Whose teaching had to be general in its scope and character, while

Paul, a lesser than Jesus, was called to be particular and local.*

5. That which supremely affected St. Paul's presentation of the Gospel has been kept to the last. Paul's gospel was to all intents and purposes the preaching of Christ crucified and risen again, and as these stupendous events lay between the preaching of Jesus and that of Paul, what wonder that they should so fill his canvas that he finds but little room for smaller details. That he preached these truths loyally, passionately, in season and out of season, is one of the strongest proofs of his attachment to Jesus, Whom he refused to know, except as crucified and risen again. Jesus had, to a certain extent, prepared the minds of His disciples for the Cross, and had foretold His Resurrection, but it is left to Paul not only to proclaim these as accomplished facts, but to be the first and for

* It is not possible here to enlarge upon points of similarity between the two gospels. We may just mention shortly five striking characteristics they had in common: (1) The harmony in their conception of God, and the stress each laid upon His Fatherhood; (2) the agreement between Paul's conception of "life" and that of Jesus in the Synoptists, which was afterwards more fully expressed in the Fourth Gospel; (3) the appeal made by both not to the letter, but to the spirit of the Old Testament; (4) the supreme place both allot to love in the Christian life, and their agreement as to the characteristics and nature of love; (5) the importance laid by both on ethics, character, and conduct rather than on outward observances, and the insistence of both upon the inwardness of true religion. Study of the Epistles of St. Paul will demonstrate his striking agreement with his Master in all of these, and his attitude to the Sacraments is a remarkable illustration of the last point. It is their inward significance and their ethical and spiritual worth which he values.

some time the sole writer, whose writings have been accorded a place in our New Testament, to show their significance as part of the great work of redemption and their meaning for Christians. So the Cross became the most prominent factor in the teaching of Paul, the Divine solution of so many problems. When we reflect upon this new background which the death and rising again of Jesus supplied to Paul, we are not surprised to find "a change in the centre of gravity."

6. Again, is not the development of which we are speaking, part of the special mission of the Paraclete, and does not the fact of Pentecost itself, with all it involves, go far to explain it? God has taught us in recent times to look at our religion historically; He has revealed to us what was hidden for many generations—the gradual process of evolution in all that lies around us; but much of this teaching was contained in our Lord's forecast of the mission of the Comforter, who was to guide His disciples into all the truth. It is of the utmost importance to remember that Paul did not enter upon Christianity (as its Founder did) at its starting-point, nor even where its Founder left it, but some two or three decades later, during which time the Paraclete had come and had been working in the Church, and had revealed many things which the disciples could not "bear" earlier. So while it is perfectly true, as Goguel says,* that Paul expresses views which go much beyond the horizon of the historical Jesus, yet it is also true that Paul was familiar with the words and thoughts of the historic Jesus, and in

* Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*, 1904.

his eschatology, doctrine of redemption, ethics, attitude towards law, and conception of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, only *carries to a further point of development* what was already present or foreshadowed, or at the least latent in the teaching of Jesus.* Of all religions Christianity was the one least intended to be static, and in God's providence St. Paul was entrusted with the task of carrying the Gospel out of one world into another, out of the Jewish world, in which it had been cradled, into the Greek world which it was soon to dominate, because here also it should prove itself to match its needs. It was Paul who first translated the faith into a language which the world outside Palestine was capable of understanding. "For the Jew Christian belief could be summed up in the words, 'Jesus is the Christ.' But beyond the circle of Jewish influence the word 'Christ' was an unknown term and conveyed no meaning at all. Paul had therefore to find a Greek equivalent, and . . . was compelled to analyze the meaning of the term and this . . . meant progress."†

So we owe to Paul the transforming of the faith of Jesus into a world-wide religion, and the saving of Christianity from being merely the religious profession of a Jewish sect. And therein surely he carried forward and developed the teaching implicit in the words of Jesus. But he did more

* *Cf. Jesus Christus und Paulus*, P. Feine.

† The above quotations are from a pamphlet by H. T. Andrews, *The Value of the Theology of St. Paul for Modern Thought*, S.P.C.K. For the growth of St. Paul's faith and teaching *cf.* Nairne, *The Faith of the New Testament*, pp. 93 *ff.*

than this, and did it by virtue of his own experience of intimate relationship with Christ; he taught others that they too could become one with Christ, and "that the Church, which had hitherto used either the past or the future tense about Christ, might use the present as well." To him "Christ was not merely a great memory or a great hope, but an abiding presence. This is, perhaps, the greatest contribution Paul made to the faith of Christianity. He saved Christian theology from being either purely historical or purely apocalyptic. He taught the Church that what mattered most was not to know Christ after the flesh—*e.g.*, as He lived in Galilee, or to be absorbed in a vision of the Parousia, but by an inner experience of the soul."*

Christ was to be a present activity within the soul of the believer. This is the germ of all which can be described as mystical Christianity. Do not those who would separate Paul from Jesus fail to recognize that the heart of the problem will be found in Paul's relation to Christ? It was a relation of love, of love to Christ for what He had done—"Who loved me and gave Himself for me." The religion of Paul is not founded upon a complex of ideas gathered either from Judaism or paganism, but upon the relationship of love to the historical Jesus. Its supreme source lay in the vivid personal experience of Jesus, which St. Paul had verified in himself and in the lives of others. It was a Christ mysticism, an experienced communion with the glorified Christ. Those who doubt the truth of this might well spend a fresh hour of thoughtful

* Quotations as last note from H. T. Andrews.

study with the writings of the Apostle, every page of which is eloquent of the fact. It is on the grounds stated above that we rest our contention that the teaching of Paul, whether regarded as a whole or, as we hope to show directly, when illustrated by his references to Baptism and Holy Communion, does not stand over against the teaching of Jesus as being of a different character, but genuinely rises out of it, and is a reasonable development of it. We are frankly sceptical of the scepticism which ranges Paul over against Jesus or bids us choose between the two.

Moreover, we have Paul's own answer in Gal. i. 8-12, where having spoken of the "Gospel of Christ," he denounces any who preach "a different gospel," and says of his own gospel, "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after men, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

Jesus and Paul. The Two Sacraments

It remains to add a few words about the more direct relationship of St. Paul's teaching about the Sacraments to that of Jesus. Evidently St. Paul found the two Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion in common use in the Church, and by the first he had himself been admitted into that Church. In more than one place—though for the most part incidentally—he makes known the Christian meanings he attaches to Baptism, while in 1 Cor. x. and xi. he deals with the other Sacra-

ment. Thus he fills out for the Churches he has founded some of the earlier teaching of his Master. Those who would have us think that Jesus said little about Sacraments, or was indifferent to them, overlook the fact that the whole key to the Sacraments lies in the truth of the Incarnation, and that if their contention is right, then the Fourth Gospel, especially in such chapters as the third and the sixth, has seriously misinterpreted Him.* Moreover, the short utterance "This is My Body," authenticated by all the narratives, contains in the germ the whole mystery of the Church's greatest Sacrament. The loyalty St. Paul manifested towards Jesus is nowhere more remarkable than in the Apostle's treatment of the Church's two great Sacraments, and we feel that the Apostle is speaking out of his own deep experience as he relates both of them to Christ. To him Baptism had meant "putting on Christ." Ananias had bidden him be baptized, "calling on the name of the Lord."† Every reference to Baptism has for its central thought "Union with Christ." The other Sacrament he regards as received by him "from the Lord," and he makes the reverent and continued use of it a test of loyalty to that Lord, connecting it closely with His death, and through it proclaiming that death till He comes

* The Fourth Gospel—a further development of Pauline teaching—is, of course, "the most Sacramental of all the Gospels, and the words 'My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed' contain in the most compressed form the doctrine of spiritual communion with Christ by Sacramental actions" (*History of Sacrament*, A. Gardiner, p. 47).

† For the full meaning of this phrase *cf.* R. B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 76, 135, 424.

again. There is no room for, or trace of, a different gospel here, but ample scope for the Apostle's master passion expressed so often in the two short words "in Christ."* And as always with St. Paul, this "in Christ" introduces into the Christian life and into the Sacraments a mystic tinge, and always includes the idea of union with a crucified Christ. This is true of both the Sacraments; Baptism in St. Paul's Epistles means "burial with Christ through baptism into death," and a consequent rising again to "newness of life." In his own case this had been experienced, and his life after Baptism was no longer his own, but Christ living in him, so he writes, "As many as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." In the other Sacrament again, the idea of being crucified with Christ has evidently a central place. 1 Cor. x. 16 involves communion with the Lord as crucified—*i.e.*, identification with the attitude of the crucified Redeemer towards sin; in other words, the breaking off relations with sin and crucifying the natural man. A careful study of St. Paul's teaching about Holy Communion in 1 Cor. v. 7, 8; x. 11, shows that communicants enter into communion with Christ, not only by being, as it were, His guests at supper, but into communion with His Body and His Blood, and a study of those expressions makes it clear that communion with His Death is intended. St. Paul uses the

* *Cf.* Eph. i. 3-13 (eleven times in ten verses), and J. A. Robinson, *Com. on Ephes.*, on i. 3 and iv. 21, pp. 22 *ff.* and 106. This union with Christ, and not any theory of justification by faith, or of sanctification, or of grace and free-will, is the central note of St. Paul's teaching.

language of sacrifice. The sacrificial death of Christ is an essential part of his thought. The worthy communicant feeds upon that sacrifice and so appropriates the blessing connected with it, and unites himself with that sacrifice and all that it involves, in its attitude to sin and readiness to suffer with and for Christ.* And herein undoubtedly we do find real development in teaching. It was not till St. Paul pressed home the significance of Christ's death as a sacrifice for sin that Christians began to realize the full significance of the rite,† and of the words spoken at the Last Supper. They had first to grasp the sacrificial aspect of Christ's death, and then—but not till then—could they understand the meaning of the Eucharist, and in the providence of God it was in a large measure given to St. Paul to relate these two factors, and to impress their connection upon the Church. But this teaching of St. Paul was a legitimate development and application of His Master's teaching. It had its root in the consciousness and teaching of Jesus concerning the necessity of His Death for the coming of the Kingdom, and therefore was no new gospel. When on the night in which He was betrayed Jesus said, "This is My Body," and when He said, "This is My Blood of the Covenant, which is shed for many," there lay in His words the germ of all which afterwards St. Paul elucidated concerning this Sacrament. St. Paul is applying that which had already been implicit in the mind of

* *Cf.* the Author's *Steps towards Intercommunion, Sacrifice in Holy Communion* (Heffer), esp. pp. 50-55.

† Obviously this applies also to the Sacrament of Baptism.

Jesus. It was as the meaning of Christ's death was increasingly realized, that the understanding of the rite grew clearer also.

NOTE I.—"KNOWING CHRIST AFTER THE FLESH"

It is a wrong interpretation of St. Paul's words in 2 Cor. v. 16 to deduce from them that he was ignorant of or indifferent to the earthly career of Jesus. There are many references to that career introduced quite incidentally, which suggest that St. Paul knew many more. It is useful to read the two Epistles to the Corinthians in this light; there are, of course, the constant references to His sufferings, death, and resurrection, and the obvious ones to His gentleness (2 Cor. x. 1), unselfishness (2 Cor. viii. 9), trustworthiness (2 Cor. i. 19), etc.; there are also more subtle ones to His example or the teaching He gave—*e.g.*, 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, 11, 13, 14; x. 27; 2 Cor. xii. 12. In other passages in his Epistles St. Paul shows his knowledge of Jesus as "a man" (1 Cor. xv. 21), born of a human mother (Gal. iv. 4), descended from Abraham (Gal. iii. 16), from David (Rom. i. 3), having human brethren (Gal. i. 19), subject to and ministering to others who were subject to Jewish ordinances (Rom. xv. 8), entirely righteous (Rom. v. 18).* It would be easy to multiply such instances, and they exhibit a very full knowledge of the character of Jesus, and of the impression He had made. Again, if the language of the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles are carefully compared, the resemblance between the teaching of the two will be found to be large, especially as regards moral teaching (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 8 with St. Luke x. 16; Gal. ix. 17 with St. Matt. xxiii. 13; Gal. vi. 2 with St. Mark ix. 35; 1 Cor. iv. 12, 13 with St. Luke vi. 28 and St. Matt. v. 11). Thus the evidence of St. Paul's Epistles is sufficient to prove the existence of such a body of teaching as we have in the Gospels and that the facts of the life, death, teaching, and person of Christ, as there recorded, were the foundations of St. Paul's doctrine. Hence we may safely conclude that it was not lack of knowledge but change

* *Cf. Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 336, to which I am indebted for the order adopted in this sentence.

of focus in St. Paul's case which explains his words in 2 Cor. v. 16. He looked up instead of back, within instead of behind. It was not the Jesus of Galilee with Whom he felt himself to be one, but the risen and ascended Christ. Therefore the earthly life of Jesus was now swallowed up in the glories of the Christ Who was at the right hand of God. St. Paul's watchword was not "in Jesus" but "in Christ," and to him the details of the earthly sojourn of Jesus were of secondary importance as compared with his personal experience of and present intercourse with the living and active Christ, Who moreover would shortly come again. It was largely a fulfilment in his own case of the advice he gives in Col. iii. 1-4, where he bids his converts to seek the Christ and the things above, not "the things that are upon the earth." St. Paul's writings do not find their centre in the historic life of Jesus, but in his experience of the risen Christ.*

NOTE II.—ON TWO TREATISES IN ENGLISH ON "JESUS AND PAUL"

Since writing this chapter I have had the good fortune to come across two treatises on the subject: 1. An article in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, by Dr. C. A. A. Scott, entitled "Jesus and Paul." It is so suggestive and instructive that had I read it before I wrote, it would have been difficult to refrain from constant quotations.† Dr. Scott in a masterly way sets out the likenesses and unlikenesses between Jesus and Paul, and explains the reasons for the latter. He also very clearly demonstrates the intimate knowledge Paul had of the life and character of Jesus, and shows how he often echoes‡

* For further treatment of this subject *cf.* Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*, 1904, pp. 69-99, and Abbé Jacquier of Lyons, *Histoire des Libres du Nouveau Testament*, 1905, in which will be found a very considerable body of evidence; *cf.* also Dr. C. A. A. Scott in art. "Jesus and Paul" (see next note), pp. 335-36 and 340-41, and Maurice Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 41, 42, and J. A. Robinson, *Com. on Ephes.*, pp. 23, 24.

† The notes at the bottom of pages in this chapter or elsewhere referring to Dr. Scott's essay have, of course, been added since I read the treatise in question.

‡ Yet, as Goguel well says, Paul was "not only an echo of Jesus, which would not do justice to the Apostle, but *tout nourri* on the words of Jesus."

the teaching of Jesus, without actually quoting Him (p. 340). Dr. Scott frankly admits the differences between the two, which were inevitable, else Jesus and Paul could neither of them have been human; but he warns against exaggerating them, and vindicates the Apostle from contradicting his Master, attributing the differences to legitimate explanations or interpretations or development. He shows that the real question is, "How is it that they agree so profoundly?" He lays stress on the difference between the experience of Jesus and that of Paul—*e.g.*, (1) Jesus was dependent only on the Father, while Paul was also dependent on Jesus; (2) Jesus always taught with authority, Paul always taught under authority; (3) Jesus knew no guilt, Paul said: "I am carnal, sold under sin"; (4) Jesus never knew the law as tyranny, Paul found refuge from the law in the Gospel. Dr. Scott also dwells upon St. Paul's eschatology as a development from the simpler doctrine of the Synoptists. On the other hand, there is no real disparity between the two, and Paul's teaching is not alien or contradictory to that of Jesus. The differences are quantitative rather than qualitative, while where development is evident, it is appropriate advance, such as we should expect in one "called upon to apply fundamental principles to new problems and new needs." All this is weightily confirmed by the remarkable correspondences between them and the similarity of mental attitude and of religious conception. Dr. Scott suggests that Jesus Christ in St. Paul's teaching occupies the place so conspicuously allotted to "the Kingdom" in the teaching of Jesus.* All this and much more is extremely helpful. But I must add with regret that Dr. Scott, thorough as his comparison of Jesus and Paul is in most respects, entirely omits—and the omission seems to me unfortunate—any reference to the attitude of Jesus or Paul to Sacraments, and therefore he does not help us so fully as he might in the study we are making.

2. On the other hand, another Divinity professor, Dr. B. W. Bacon of Yale University, in his book *Jesus and Paul*, amply atones for the omission of his brother professor, and bases Paul's gospel and his likeness to Jesus primarily upon his attitude to the two Sacraments, saying: "We discover, first of all, that the two

* While this is generally absent from St. Paul's teaching, we must not overlook Acts xx. 25, "Among whom I went about preaching the Kingdom."

ordinances of the Communion and Baptism are the true Ur-evangelium, and that Paul's Christianity is an interpretation of these" (p. 107); and again, "Not books, then, but these two observances form the true Ur-evangelium" (p. 9). He contends, also, that the two great Pauline doctrines of Justification and Sanctification "reflect the sense he finds in the Supper and Baptism" (p. 26), and that "in the end the supreme expression of Paul's gospel becomes the symbolic utterance of the Sacrament." There is much more in the same strain, and we may refer also to another book by the same author, *The Founding of the Church*, chap. iv., "Baptism and the Breaking of Bread," where his views are further elucidated. The following is a recent reference to this writer:

"Professor Bacon of Yale, himself a higher critic, but also a warm evangelical. . . . His contention is that those who have absorbed the newer knowledge and the critical standpoint ought to show that these are not inconsistent with warm evangelical zeal and positive faith in a supernatural Christ. The Church needs education in the truer view of Scripture by men who believe heartily in the Gospel of Grace revealed in the New Testament. Beyond any reasonable doubt, the truth gained by criticism is not a menace to faith but a help and a buttress to it."—*The Expository Times*, October, 1923, p. 7.

NOTE III.—TESTIMONIES FROM GERMAN SCHOLARS

It may be helpful to put on record some other testimonies of scholars as to the resemblances between Jesus and Paul. We append those of four well-known German writers.

"In the opinion of the great majority of those who have studied him, the true view is that Paul was one who understood his Master and continued His work. This opinion is borne out by the facts."—Harnack, *What is Christianity?* E. T., crown edit., p. 179.

"Paradoxical as it may seem, Paul, who never saw Jesus in the flesh or listened to His words, grasped the innermost spirit of Jesus more purely and more deeply than the first disciples."—Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, i. 33.

"Notwithstanding all formal differences in his religious thought, Paul is, nevertheless, in reality the perpetuator of the religion of Jesus, being most sympathetically related to Jesus in inward experience, burning with the fire of Jesus' enthusiasm, and so His

best interpreter, although employing a wholly different language." —J. Weiss in *Amer. J. of Theology*, July, 1913, p. 353.

"Paul was really the man who best understood Jesus, and carried on His work."—J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und judische Geschichte*, sixth edition, 1907, p. 386.

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTER VIII

The literature is, of course, enormous, and only a few books bearing on the special aspect under consideration need be mentioned here—new books appear constantly. For the idea of development in this chapter and others, see *H.D.B.*, art. on "The Religion of Israel," by Dr. Kautsch, in extra volume.

RAMSAY: *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895. *The Teaching of St. Paul in the Terms of the Present Day*, 1913, and many other works.

GOGUEL: *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*, 1901.

FEINE: *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, 1902.

CLEMEN: *Paulus*, 1904.

B. W. BACON: *The Story of St. Paul*, 1905, and *Jesus and Paul*, 1921.

WEINEL: *St. Paul, the Man and His Work*, E.T., 1906.

DU BOSE: *The Gospel According to St. Paul*, 1907.

WREDE: *Paul*, E.T., 1907.

Cambridge Biblical Essays, "Jesus and Paul," 1909.

A. MEYER: *Jesus or Paul*, E.T., 1909.

J. WEISS: *Paul and Jesus*, E.T., 1909.

VON DOBSCHÜTZ: *The Apostolic Age*, E.T., 1909.

MOFFATT: *Paul and Paulinism*, 1910.

KNOWLING: *The Testimony of Paul to Christ*, 1911.

GARVIE: *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, 1911.

J. H. MOULTON: "The Gospel according to Paul," *The Expositor*, viii. 2.

A. DEISSMANN: *St. Paul*, E.T., 1912, and *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, 1923.

A. H. MCNEILL: *New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's*, 1923.

D. M. ROSS: *The Faith of St. Paul*, 1923.

CHAPTER IX

ST. PAUL AND THE MYSTERIES

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER IX

Rise of ancient mystery cults and their chief characteristics. What is the relation between them and St. Paul's sacramental teaching? Is Paulinism and the sacramental teaching of St. Paul a separate entity, or is it the first step towards Hellenizing the Gospel? Is it in true succession to the teaching of Jesus? A growing number of scholars investigating the subject. The problem is of recent date, and the material for a decision is as yet not sufficiently sifted. It must be regarded as open, and progress can be reported. Examples of French, German, and English writers, who hold that St. Paul was much influenced, with quotations showing this. Examples of those who adhere to Hebraic rather than Hellenistic origin, with quotations. Observations on position created by the enquiry. No ground for uneasiness. While clear that there are striking resemblances, there are also difficulties which advocates of Hellenism have to face—viz., (*a*) Chronology; (*b*) Terminology; (*c*) Psychology. A suggestion for solving the problem. *Note* on The Christian Sacraments and the Mysteries.

CHAPTER IX

ST. PAUL AND THE MYSTERIES

No treatise on the subject of the origin of Holy Communion could omit the consideration of St. Paul's attitude towards the Greek mystery cults and the enquiry as to how far his sacramental teaching has been influenced by them.* All will be agreed that there are striking parallels between the two, and much common terminology, though these resemblances are capable of differing explanations. A growing number of scholars—not so many English as foreign, though scholarship knows no barriers of nationality—are investigating the matter, thereby implying the seriousness of the problem, and that it is at present both an open and an obscure one.†

* Secularist lecturers commonly use plausible arguments to assert that Christianity has borrowed its Sacraments and other teachings from Mithraism. The error underlying this statement will be shown later in this chapter. Nevertheless, the fact that Christianity, itself an Oriental religion, appeared about the same time as various Oriental mystery cults came under the influences of the Hellenic spirit, and equally with them offered itself to the world, renders the rivalry between them and it a matter of intense interest (*cf.* Maurice Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, p. 121).

† "The great characteristic feature of Oriental religion, as it sweeps over the Roman Empire, is its vagueness. . . . Fog is religion's vital breath in this period" (Glover, *Progress in Religion*, p. 322).

And it will be obvious that this at once sets a limit to the completeness of any present treatment, and implies that the study of these religions is of comparatively recent growth, and has not yet yielded sufficient data for a final decision. At one moment the rising tide of Hellenism seems likely to submerge everything else, and then the tide ebbs, and the old tradition emerges unshaken. Just now the emphasis is on Hellenism, and Hebraism is belittled. Will this be the final verdict? Seeing, then, that the matter is still *sub judice*, we shall only attempt to state the problem, and to indicate some directions in which information is needed.

1. Christians are confronted with a formidable body of opinion which maintains that a great part of Christian belief is derived from notions current in the Hellenic world. Some, like Gunkel, would describe Christianity as a syncretistic religion, a combination of primitive Christianity and Hellenism. A considerable number of scholars, especially abroad, hold that a connection exists, some think more and some less, between St. Paul's teaching and the mysteries, and that the latter have influenced and moulded his views, and that the Hellenizing of Christianity, which became so conspicuous later, is in the first instance to be laid at his door.*

2. On the other hand, a large body of sound and open-minded scholarship still continues to rest satisfied that the sacramental teaching of St. Paul

* *Cf.* Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, vol. i., "St. Paul," who says that "St. Paul, who was ready to fight to the death against the Judaizing of Christianity, was willing to take the first step, and a long one, towards the paganizing of it."

arises quite naturally out of the Hebrew (and not out of the Greek) background of his experience, and is the genuine and unadulterated Christian expression of the religion of Jesus, which St. Paul had embraced, and which owes nothing to pagan influences. As all will agree that truth is truth from whatsoever source it comes, we must be impartial, and endeavour to weigh fearlessly the evidence for each side of this subject and look at the facts with absolute objectivity. The problem arises thus. In the Hellenistic age, between the time of Alexander the Great and the Roman conquest, the civic worship of Greek deities fell into decay, and there was an invasion of secret religious cults from the East (some of which had arrived still earlier) which spread as far as Italy. The most famous were the Greek mysteries of Dionysus, of Orpheus, of Eleusis, and the Oriental mystery cults of Cybele and Attis, of Osiris or Serapis, and of Isis,* with bits of Chaldean astronomy, and the religion which for a time threatened to be a sturdy rival of Christianity, Mithraism.† Those best known in Greece were the

* Want of space prevents any description of these various cults, but a short and illuminating one will be found in J. M. Jones's *New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 122-132, while Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 478-571, affords a careful account of Orphism and of the mysteries of Eleusis; *cf.* also *The Hellenistic Age*, Essays by J. B. Bury, E. A. Barber, E. Bevan, and W. W. Tarn, 1923.

† It is probable that in the second century this cult, which was undoubtedly the highest and best of the heathen religions in the Empire, had more worshippers than Christianity, with which it has striking resemblances. In *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, pp. 47-58, Bigg gives a very interesting description of this religious cult.

mysteries of Demeter and of her daughter Eleusis, which latter proved a source of inspiration to Plato. As a result of all this mixture, Greek, Orphic, Pythagorean, Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Judæan, with a plentiful infusion of magic, there arose a great vague body of popular religions, which Reitzenstein denominates "Hellenistic theology."* These religions have three notable characteristics: they have rites of purification, they profess to produce communion with some deity, and they undertake to ensure a happy reception in the next world.† The rite of purification is also one of vision, the spectacle repeating in a drama the experience of the god. Yet the initiates are not mere spectators, but actors as well, for it is by sharing in the death and resurrection of the god that they participate in his immortality. The union, of course, is effected by rites of a secret character. Moreover, the mystery religions are characterized by the guarantee of a blessed immortality which they promise to their initiates. It will at once be seen that there is much which is attractive in these cults, and much which resembles Christianity. While all agree that the Christian Church drew a definite line somewhere, as when, *e.g.*, in the next century, such a development as Gnosticism having arisen, the Church expelled it, the question remains, as to what terms, if any, did St. Paul make with these movements. Is the assertion true that St.

* *Cf.* Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 1904, where the Hermetic mystery literature is fully and lucidly treated, and Edwyn Bevan, *Hellenism and Christianity*.

† *Cf.* Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienswesen*, p. 37.

Paul, having taken over from primitive Christianity a belief in Jesus as the Messiah, later developed this religious germ into a quite new and different religion, by imparting various ideas from the mystery religions? Did he thus invent a Christian mystery religion with a more or less elaborate system of sacramental lustrations and communions which he had discovered in the mystery religions? Or was Paulinism and the Pauline teaching of the Sacraments a distinct entity, wholly separate from Greek and pagan theology, and so a legitimate interpretation of the teaching of Christ and an honest following in His footsteps?

1. Supporters of Hellenistic Influences.—To illustrate the position adopted by those who assert that St. Paul borrowed from the mysteries, we propose to call in witness a French, a German, and an English writer, and thus endeavour to exemplify the conclusions to which such a theory leads.

(*a*) M. Loisy may be described as one of the most eminent French modernists.

For a time he strove to combine with a very negative criticism a determined defence of the Roman Catholic system, but later he was deposed from his priesthood, and expelled from the Church he had tried to uphold. In a late work* he puts forth the following views: The Gospel story which Jesus taught was not in any sense a mystery religion, nor was the Gospel as taught by the original

* *Les Mystères Païens et le Mystère Chrétien.* A review of this appeared in the *Times Literary Supplement* for December 25, 1919, to which obligation is here expressed.

Apostles. But nevertheless it was by a contemporary of Jesus, Paul of Tarsus, that it was transformed into a mystery religion, and as such it conquered the Mediterranean world. The Gospel, as preached by Paul, has all the features of a mystery —" The principle of salvation is faith in a redemption, in a myth of sacrifice, in the perpetual efficacy of a Divine death, and the participation in the very spirit of a Divine Redeemer; Baptism has become a rite of initiation, the Lord's Supper a rite for initiates, and by both is realized the possession of the Spirit, the identification of the faithful with the Saviour Christ, by means of which, as in the mysteries, a happy immortality is guaranteed."*

It will be obvious to all that such a position suggests a distinction between Jesus Christ and St. Paul, which cannot be pursued further here, but for which we may at least confidently affirm that it is not only not generally allowed by scholars, but against which an immense volume of modern (we might even say modernist) evidence may be adduced.†

(*b*) Another advocate of an extreme character is the German Reitzenstein, who regards it as proved that the " Deification and transfiguration of the living man is derived from the mysteries," and that " Paul represents a kind of ancient Jewish prophetism modified by the influence of Hellenistic mystery beliefs."‡

* *Times Literary Supplement* already referred to.
† See Chap. VIII. on Jesus Christ and St. Paul.
‡ *Cf. Die Hellenisten Mysterienreligionen.*

Reitzenstein and Heitzmuller and Bousset* (in his *Kyrios Christos*, Göttingen, 1921) have pressed this view earnestly. We think that there is a one-sidedness in concluding that everything which in Paul is not explicable from the Old Testament is to be traced to mystery faiths, and that these authors omit to take into account later Jewish literature and eschatology in post-Danielic writings, as, *e.g.*, *The Discourses of Jesus* and *The Apocalypses of Baruch*, *Ezra*, etc. In his last book† Reitzenstein derives everything from the Iranian mystery religion, but his arguments will not convince most scholars. On the other hand, is there not a germ of truth in Reitzenstein's words, "Paul was a mystic before his conversion, and this is attested by his allegorical exegesis of Scripture"? (*ibid.*, p. 199).

(*c*) The English writer we will refer to is Professor Lake, though in his case the shield is reversed, and he traces the direct influence of Hellenic cults and ideas about religion not so much to St. Paul as to his converts—a very different proposition, the pursuit of which may prove fruitful. In all Lake's books reference is made to the influence exerted by the mystery religions. We will quote shortly from three of these. In *The Beginnings of*

* *Cf.* Machen's *Origin of Paul's Religion*, last three chapters, for opposite opinions to Bousset and Reitzenstein; also Gore's *Belief in Christ* under the two authors' names in the index, and pp. 99 and 192.

† *Op. cit.*, revised, Teubner, 1920. Here Reitzenstein has devoted much labour to documents of Persian, Manichæan, and Mandoean religions, and the Egyptian influence, so much emphasized in *Poimandres* and first edition of *op. cit.*, is now in the background.

Christianity, by Jackson and Lake, we are told that Christianity was formed by a process of synthesis, and is the product of two such processes. The first was the adoption of Greek Oriental cults, conceptions of private salvation and sacraments being derived from the mystery religions of the Empire. The second was doctrinal, when this sacramentalized Christianity began to come to terms with Greek philosophy, as the other mystery religions tried to do. In Lake's *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (1911) we are told that the influence of the Oriental mystery religions was increased by the fact that not only the Jews but every Eastern nation had its "Diaspora" in the Roman Empire. . . . Therefore, it was the Orontes, and not the Jordan, which seemed to be flowing into the Tiber, and as there was a Jewish Diaspora with its proselytizing propaganda, so there were Egyptian, Syrian, Persian, and other Diasporæ, in which the varying cults were taught (p. 42). Later we are told that "Christianity has not borrowed from the mystery religions, because it was always—at least in Europe—a mystery religion itself" (p. 215), and that "the majority of the Church of Corinth was drawn from the 'God-fearers,' though some were Jews. But the main feature was that they all accepted Christianity as a mystery religion, which really could do what other mystery religions pretended to do. Jesus was to the Corinthians the Redeemer-God, who had passed through death to life, and offered participation in a new life to those who shared in the mysteries which He offered. These mysteries were Baptism and the Eucharist, and there

was unanimity in Corinth, as to their central importance" (p. 233). In *Landmarks of Early Christianity* (1920), under the chapter "Corinth," we are told that "In Antioch Jesus became the divine centre of a cult. It is remarkable that Paul and other Antiochian missionaries became enthusiastic agents of this (unless we can prove that in the Diasporæ, the Hellenizing of the Jews had spread much more than is supposed). The result was that Christianity became a Græco-Oriental cult offering salvation as other mystery religions. . . . The Christianity of 1 Cor. conforms to this type . . . there is a general resemblance of the Christian offer of salvation to the other cults."

2. Upholders of Hebrew Influences.—We have referred at some length to those who trace early Christianity to Greece, because we feel that such teaching will be unfamiliar to many. Obviously it is not necessary to devote the same space to those who hold quite different opinions regarding St. Paul's teaching, and who advocate with confidence its Hebrew and not Hellenistic origin. But we cannot altogether omit to refer to the views of some living scholars, who, having impartially considered the problem, remain entirely satisfied that we are mistaken if we call in the heathen mysteries to explain or account for St. Paul's teaching. Some of these contend that, so far as the Apostle took the heathen mysteries into account, he not only did not recognize in them any power for good, but held them in contempt, and regarded them rather as the work of devils than as a divine preparation for Christianity. His Christian atmosphere differed

so greatly from them that an impassable gulf existed, and to him they appeared only as travesties of the Gospel. Moreover, while he necessarily adopted the Greek language, and even the vernacular of the mystery cults, and also Greek thought and dress, yet his mind was in no sense hospitable to anything from pagandom, nor in any degree syncretistic. His Christianity was clearly the outcome of Judaism, and he always looked through Jewish and Christian spectacles, while his religious views were a constant reflection of his own past experience.

In other words, "Christianity for St. Paul was no new religion, but simply Judaism, with its centre of gravity shifted in consequence of a new era," and "we may leave out Greek influence, and base Paul's doctrine entirely on Jewish primitive Christianity."*

Elsewhere the same writer (whose eschatological views are, of course, well known) says: "Every further logical step in this direction involves further sacrifice of historical understanding, and an increasing necessity to indulge in imaginary constructions. But all these consequences are already present in germ in the mere assertion that Paul is to be understood from the mystery religions, even though those who maintain this view do not want to proceed any farther than the facts which have to be explained seem to them to warrant."†

Other foreign scholars may be quoted in the same strain—*e.g.*, Anrich‡ says that "Pauline

* Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, p. 240.

† *Ibid.*, p. 236.

‡ *Cf. The Ancient Mysteries and their Influence on Christianity.*

views of Christianity are to be understood as in the main original creations of the Christian spirit, on the basis of genuine Judaism." Clemen,* Von Dobschütz, and Feine take the same line. On p. 157 of this chapter we have referred to Machen and Gore, who combat the theories of Reitzenstein and Bousset.

We have left to the last our own Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy, whose book† is described by Dean Rashdall as "our foremost discussion of the subject," and as "a very judicial summing up of the whole matter." Dr. Kennedy feels that it is "a chief defect in explorers among the mystery religions to overestimate the significance of their discoveries, and their failure is in being sufficiently rigorous in the application of the historical method. . . . The Old Testament is a perfectly adequate explanation of the ideas and usages in the Epistles of Paul, which it is the fashion to associate with Hellenic influence." But the same writer adds: "If the mystery theory of Pauline Christianity can be established, many of our fundamental ideas concerning Paul's religious outlook need to be transformed. . . . We must courageously face such a transformation, if the facts demand it." Dean Rashdall entirely supports this Old Testament source, and considers anything else gratuitous. In his eyes the basis of Paul's teaching is Jewish —the Hellenic Judaism of Tarsus—and Apocalyptic, rather than Rabbinic, but owing nothing to the mystery religions.

The following observations may be made:

* *Cf. Prim. Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*, 1912, E.T.

† *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, 1913.

1. Those who seek truth at all costs will fearlessly follow any gleam which may throw light on this difficult question, and will determine that facts shall not be forced to fit a theory, but that a theory must be sought which will satisfactorily explain facts. The science of comparative religions is of modern growth, and we are being taught that not all which comes from pagan sources is suspect, much less necessarily impure and devilish. The origin of an idea is no safe criterion of its worth. If St. Paul can be proved to have borrowed from the mysteries, it would by no means be fatal to the truth of his doctrines. When people resent a comparison between Christianity and the mystery religions, they forget that the latter, however imperfect or even base and sensual in part they were, are still the record of men "seeking after God, if haply they might find Him." Though such a record is always largely one of failure and disappointment, yet the fundamental needs of men are everywhere alike, and since both within and without the Christian Church the Divine Light shines, any real points of similarity will help to remind us that the Light which shone clearly in Christendom is the same light which was breaking in by degrees upon heathendom.* Both Hebrew and Greek move towards the same goal propelled by a like impulse. M. Loisy himself bears eloquent testimony to the way the higher and purer faith overcame the lower and baser conceptions of paganism, when he says:

"The Christian mystery, having borrowed much

* *Cf.* St. John i. 9 and Westcott *in loc.*

from the pagan mysteries, went on to supplant them and to eliminate them, because it had the advantage over them of a firmer doctrine of God and of immortality; of a Divine Saviour, more living, nearer the heart, and possessed of a place in history. . . . It had to conquer or to die, and it did not die." It is always wise to remember that Christianity came not merely as a revolution, but as a fulfilment, and that it has no need to deny pagan adumbrations of the great truths which it came to reveal.

2. Those who have tried to assimilate the lessons of Evolution, will not be unwilling to allow the possibility of Heb. i. 1, having its application here, and will gladly recognize "the soul of good in things evil," and feel that God "fulfils Himself in many ways," and that the mystery religions may have been to the pagan world a *preparatio evangelica* which a wise teacher could use for Christian ends.

"The glory of Christianity is not to be as unlike other religions as possible, but to be their perfection and fulfilment,"* and those who regard Christianity as the saving of the world, will not feel astonished if its origin proves to have been mingled with the soil from which it sprang, and will feel that this is a true illustration of the teaching of the Incarnation. We have learned not to value humanity less highly, since we were taught that it has developed slowly through the ages, from simian ancestors, and even lower forms of life. Rather do we magnify the Divine Wisdom which made such things possible, and set in order such processes of development. The value of the Christian mystery is quite another

* B. Jowett.

matter than its historic precedents or the preliminary movements which led to it. It has to be tested by history and experience.

3. If the scholars are right who to-day tell us that Catholicism, as we know it, and as it has developed from the second century onwards, is a product of Hellenism, then those who glory in the name "Catholic" will naturally rejoice if they can trace back to St. Paul, at least the beginnings of this development, and more especially if they can, with justice, regard it as a legitimate outcome—applied under new conditions of life and surroundings—of the teachings of Paul's Master, *e.g.*, Dean Inge writes: "The Catholic conception of Sacraments as bonds uniting religious communities, and as channels of grace flowing from a corporate treasury, was as certainly part of the Greek mystery religion as it was foreign to Judaism." "It was as a Mystery religion that Europe accepted Christ . . . the Greeks took the whole scheme of mysteries, with Sacraments, purifications and fasts, the idea of a mystical brotherhood, and the doctrine of salvation, through membership in a Divine society, worshipping Christ as the patronal deity of their mysteries. Historically, this type of Christianity is the origin of Catholicism both Western and Eastern."*

* *Outspoken Essays*, vol. i., "St. Paul." A like testimony is borne again and again by Dr. Lake, who is fond of insisting that "the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist is much more primitive than the Protestant." Also by Heiler: "Already we find Apostolic Christianity beginning to be Catholic . . . immediately after Jesus' death" (*Der Katholizismus*, etc., p. 43). E. Troeltsch says, "Christianity has been bound up from the first with all the intellectual forces of Hellenism" (*Christian Thought*, p. 31).

The question to be decided is when this process commenced, and whether St. Paul began it or opened the door to it. Did he deliberately take this great step in the de-judaizing of the Gospel, and in the process necessary to the fulfilment of its Catholic spirit and destiny? Did he thus carry a stage further the Christianity of Stephen to which he was converted? Ludemann was one of the first to suggest this in 1872, and the connection he traced between St. Paul and Greek rather than Jewish antecedents, has been taken up and elaborated by many since. How much truth is there in the suggestion?

4. Those who have studied St. Paul most deeply, and recall his words about being "a debtor both to the Greeks and to barbarians," will not want to deprive his tribute of any of its meaning. They will agree that he had opportunities, denied to others, of acquiring intimate knowledge of Greek culture, and that he was a man of a peculiarly receptive mind, and that, if he was persuaded that there were elements which rendered the Greek mystery cults preparatory to the Gospel—*e.g.*, their ideas of redemption, of new birth, of mystical union—then he would be very likely to bring their forces within the Christian pale, and "set them to draw the chariot of the conquering Christ." He may well have felt that while they satisfied some, they intensified for others the yearning after holiness and immortality, which the Gospel of Christ fully met, and if so, while he would discriminate, and assimilate only what held promise of fruit, yet he would not reject any of the good. We should be clearly mistaken if we went further

than this. St. Paul was not simply the product of his environment. His own religion was not influenced by these religions; he never believed himself to be mystically one with Christ because he had learnt that pagans held a similar view; he never saw new meanings in Holy Communion because heathen mysteries had revealed them to him (he had his own revelation which he traced back to Christ); but we may find truth in believing that he helped to transplant Christianity from the narrow field of Judaism into the broad field of Hellenic culture, and introduced into it a leaven which would leaven the Gentile world.

5. We said earlier that the tide of Hellenism ebbs and flows, and that at present it is flowing somewhat strongly. Let us enumerate some of the rocks on which it may break:

(*a*) *Chronology*. — The incompleteness of our present knowledge prevents our deciding too hastily when the first impact between Christianity and the mysteries took place. A few years ago Professor Burkitt said that in the present state of New Testament study in this country it is more important to have mistaken views about this question than to have no views at all; and Professor Percy Gardner, in his *Religious Experience of St. Paul*, acknowledges that our knowledge is very imperfect, and that it is difficult to add to it. At that time (1893) he said there was no great classical work on the mysteries, and that even a trained investigator would be repelled by the slight and scattered character of the evidence and the vague and contradictory information available. Since that there has been a big output of

literature, and we have works among others by Cumont, Norden, Dieterich, Frazer, Glover, Clemen, Estlin Carpenter, etc. But while no very definite consensus of opinion has been reached, there is a good deal of hesitation among scholars on the question of chronology. Cumont, who is our chief authority on Mithraism, and who is followed by Kennedy and many others, affirms that on this score it is impossible that Mithraism* could have had any point of contact with St. Paul, and the whole question of how far the mystery religions had assumed their importance in St. Paul's time is still disputed. Schweitzer† asserts that their general spread in the Græco-Roman world (with the possible exception of the Serapis mystery cult) dates from the beginning of the second century. Harnack's view is that Christian belief at the end of the second century displays a Hellenization of the original Gospel, and that the process had already begun in New Testament times, but that the real influx of Greek life and thought began about A.D. 130. That the mystery religions were flourishing in the second century is clear, and some think that such elaboration of form postulates a long previous development. Moreover, in the second century it was more than Hellenism, and included many of those cults which, as we have already said, are summed up by Reitzenstein in the comprehensive phrase "Hellenistic

* F. G. Kenyon on *Mithraism and the Fall of Paganism* says that Mithraism as an eclectic religion may have borrowed from Christianity, but that the reverse is chronologically impossible; and L. Patterson in *Mithraism and Christianity* says it is "paltering with truth to compare the teaching of the two."

† *Geschichte des Paulinischen Forschung*, 1911.

theology."* Christianity found herself confronted with this, and had to select and assimilate. Evidently then, in the providence of God, Hellenism had a real work to do, and the only point seriously at issue is when this work began. Dr. Sanday has shown that the three main elements in Christianity "as a formulated system" are: (1) The foundation of Hebrew religion; (2) the specially Christian element due to the life and work of Christ; (3) the peculiar forms of expression which are, to a large extent, of Greek origin.† How much of this third element entered into Christianity before the second century?

(*b*) *Terminology*.—Below we deal shortly with some of the parallels of language between St. Paul and the mysteries. These are numerous and striking, but the fact that St. Paul employs terms which bore a close resemblance to conceptions current in the heathen world, and had a more or less technical meaning in the mystery religions, does not necessarily imply his adopting their ideas, and we have to beware of the temptation to find identifications where there are only external resemblances. To trace an analogy is not always to discover a cause, and partial resemblances do not always imply common sources. It is, of course, difficult to separate sharply between thought and terminology, because the latter necessarily by degrees shapes the former, and new words bring new meanings. So here again a suspension of judgment may be needed. Common terminology may mean little or much at

* *Cf.* Edwyn Bevan in *Hellenism and Christianity*.

† *The Oracles of God* (1891), p. 118.

the outset, and every missionary has to use, adapt, and baptize into the service of Christ the language of those among whom he works. If it can be proved that St. Paul would meet with people familiar with the mysteries in Corinth, Athens, Rome, Ephesus, Tarsus, and elsewhere,* and if his converts were drawn from such sources, St. Paul would naturally have special facilities for acquiring a deep insight into their religions, and could in consequence use many of their terms in a higher and Christian sense, but we must beware of assuming that he attached to them the same meaning as the heathen, in their unregenerate days, had done. *E.g.*, Bousset, who is an upholder of the theory which derives St. Paul's Sacramentalism from pagan mystery religions, in his *Kyrios Christos* (1913) arrays together all the analogies which exhaustive erudition can discover between primitive Christianity and the pagan cults, but admits " the distinctive Christian mysticism of Paul, his ' in Christ ' ' in the Lord ' is something which offers a sharply marked contrast to the ideal of deification prevalent in Hellenic piety, even if it shows an affinity with it on certain sides " (pp. 172-3).

We must not easily assume because the Christian and the adherent of the mystery religions adopt the same language that they start from the same premises, or mean the same thing, or are making for the same goal. Words on the lips of a genius do not mean the same as spoken by the common

* The Eleusinian mysteries were celebrated on the road from Corinth to Athens, and Ephesus was the headquarters of mystic religion in Asia.

people. "It is the measure of spiritual insight in the thinker who uses the words that gives the meaning to the words."*

Paul's Terminology and Mystery Religions.—Instances of terms used by St. Paul, which, in the mystery religions, bear a more or less technical meaning and carry mystic associations, are: μυστήριον (mystery), τέλειοι (fully initiated), μυεῖν (to learn secrets in mysteries), γνῶσις (knowledge), ψυχικός (psychic), πνευματικός (spiritual), ἀποκάλυψις (revelation), σοφία (wisdom), and many others could be added.

In Romans viii. and in the Immortality section of 2 Cor. v. St. Paul distinctly makes use of ideas connected with the Hellenic mystery religions. In 1 Cor. ii. 1 *ff.* (especially 6 and 7), we find groups of conceptions which bear the same character, and where, as in the mysteries, a higher grade of understanding and a more advanced stage of knowledge are demanded. Another approximation is found in 1 Cor. xv. 37, where he dwells on the seed corn taking on a new body after dissolution in the earth.†

(*c*) *Psychology.*—There is a very wide difference between the ethical and moral content of the Christian mystery and that of the heathen mysteries, and the contrast goes far to establish the fact that so far as St. Paul incorporated ideas from the latter, it was not so much in the centre as in the outlying regions of his theology, and that Harnack's judgment is very weighty, when he says, "Criticism which is to-day more than ever inclined

* *Cf.* Glover, *Progress in Religion*, pp. 329-330.

† *Cf.* for this subject B. W. Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, p. 105.

to make Paul into a Hellenist (so, *e.g.*, Reitzenstein) would do well to gain at the outset a more accurate knowledge of the Jew and the Christian Paul, before it estimates the secondary elements which he took over from the Greek mysteries. It would then see at once that these elements could have obtruded themselves on him only as uninvited guests, and that a deliberate acceptance is out of the question." While the Christian Sacraments have clear analogies to the ritual of the mystery cults, in that they too are symbolical acts, in which those initiated (by Baptism) have a share, and through which direct communion with God in Christ is realized, yet in the following directions important differences will be found:

1. Christianity, unlike the mystery religions, has a distinct historical basis. The Christian story and the Christian Sacraments belong to a particular age, though they avail for all ages. Christians can produce dates, facts, historical details. The mysteries have no historic background, and are independent of time. They are but mythological personifications and legends. This is a tremendous distinction. Julian the Apostate said of the Attis myth: "These things never happened, but are always true." The Christian mystery, on the contrary, did happen. It has a place in history, and its effects remain and are always true.

2. Christian rites are open to all, and the Christian Church has never become a secret brotherhood of devotees, as did the mystery cults.

3. Christianity is an effective religion of redemption, and at its centre it places not only the Cross,

with all its moral implications,* but the tremendous personality of the Crucified One, through Whom Christians seek salvation, and Who differs *toto cælo* from the gods and heroes of the mystery religions. These latter are purely mythical and have little ethical value, nor anything that can be properly called edifying, except in the way of symbolism.

4. The apocalyptic element, which, rightly understood, is so stimulating for holiness, is entirely wanting in the mysteries, and there is no expectation of a readjustment on earth at the hands of One Who has suffered and will return to right wrong and to raise the faithful to share His glory. The eschatological hope, with all it includes, is lacking in the mysteries.

5. The ethical chasm between the two is immense. In Jewish and Christian thought conduct is always prominent, but not in the mysteries. Christianity is always a moral religion, but the mysteries are magical rather than ethical. Christianity insists that sacramental grace involves holy living, and not mere mystical ecstasy as an end, while in the mysteries truth and ethics are altogether subsidiary to emotion and sensation. Therefore St. Paul, whose interest was inseparable from moral renewal and fellowship with God and a change from heathen unrighteousness to Christian righteousness, could, in no possible way, put them on the same level as Christianity.

* *Cf.* Dr. Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, Introd., p. xi: "Christianity *per genus* is a religion, *per differentiam* it is the religion of the Cross. . . . The Cross is the peculiar property of the Gospel, etc."

In fact, in *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, Dr. Kennedy, in comparing the central conceptions of these religions with St. Paul's outlook, and after the "salvation" idea of each has been carefully considered and contrasted, concludes: "This reveals at a glance the impassable cleft between Paul and the mystery religions in their central experience"; and later: "It requires an unusually daring imagination to fill these terms in the mystery cults with the profound ethical content which they held for St. Paul. We admit a certain kinship in the imagery, but the imagery has been the common property of mystics and philosophers and preachers throughout the ages" (pp. 221 and 228).

We have tried to suggest lines of thought on each side of this difficult subject. The resemblances are a matter of history, but what they actually prove is a different matter. It is possible to regard them as (1) a corruption of the primitive faith, a deviation from the pure Gospel of Jesus (some adopt this view); (2) or as a divinely ordained evolution, seeds of which had been sown long before, and which, as the effect and result of Christ's life and teaching, sprang at last into being. It is well to remember that these resemblances were noticed as early as Justin Martyr, who thought that evil demons had taught the worshippers of Mithra to imitate Christian ceremonies.* Of other Greek influences Justin speaks very differently, for he says "we teach the same as the Greeks," and "the teachings of Plato are not alien to those of Christ, and the same is true of the Stoics."

* J. Martyr's *Apology*, 1, 54, 62, 66.

In grouping for clearness' sake the above differences under the three heads of Chronology, Terminology, and Psychology, I have, of course, not exhausted the subject. The following additional points should be shortly referred to. The first two are urged strongly by Schweitzer.*

1. It would have been extremely improbable that the other leaders of the early Church should have acquiesced in St. Paul remaining an accredited teacher of the Church, had he deliberately introduced, in the way suggested, heathen beliefs and influences.

2. Every student of St. Paul has to reckon with the fact that his theology exercised very little, if any, influence upon the Church of the next two centuries, and only became a formative power when interpreted and enforced by Augustine and others who followed in his footsteps. The difficulty of believing, on the one hand, that St. Paul drastically changed the whole presentation of the Gospel of the Apostolic Church, and on the other hand subsequently his teaching ceased for a long time to effect the development of Christian doctrine in the East, is very great. The two are not easily reconciled.

3. The Christianity proclaimed by St. Paul may be described as in the process of formation. It is a growing and developing force, and not stationary like the mysteries. At the same time, while St. Paul is Catholic and open-minded to new truths, he is very exclusive when brought face to face with error, while the mysteries are in most cases eclectic and without discrimination.

* *St. Paul and his Interpreters*, pp. 192 *ff.* and 229 *f.*

Our survey will not have been without use if it has helped us to see more clearly why Christianity prevailed and supplanted the ancient beliefs. It was by no accident, but by its inherent fitness to be the religion of a civilized world. However much of the best elements of the old faiths were absorbed, they reappeared only as transfigured doctrines in a conquering system immeasurably superior to themselves. It was clearly the survival of the fittest.

Before this chapter is concluded there is a suggestion which seems worth offering. Does the solution of the problem here stated lie in the condition of later Judaism—*i.e.*, pre-Christian Judaism? Was it not already to a large extent Hellenized, chiefly, of course, though not quite exclusively, outside Palestine? In this case, may we not carry further back the syncretism of which we have spoken and believe that it had occurred earlier, in the case of Judaism and Orientalism and the mystery religions?*

If so, while the Synoptists give us the story of the direct impression made by Jesus upon the hearts and minds of Galilean disciples, who were instinctively attracted by Him, yet outside Palestine, especially around the Mediterranean Sea, lay a vast Diaspora, yearning also for the truth, whose Judaism was already to a large extent Hellenized, to many of whom St. Paul brought the Christian message which was to complete their faith. This was the Diaspora of the Græco-Roman world, with its Greek Bible, Greek forms of worship, Greek (Christian) names, Greek organization; and St. Paul

* *Cf.* Moffatt, *Approach to New Testament*, p. 162.

himself, a Jew of Tarsus,* a Greek city which had deeply influenced him during his years of residence, was, in the providence of God, to find here a fruitful field of work. It would seem clear that if in Pauline Christianity there is a mixture of Hellenism yet the Synoptic tradition is free from it.† It would seem equally clear that to deny the influence of Hellenism among the people to whom St. Paul ministered would be impossible. How much St. Paul's Christianity was affected by it is a matter of opinion. To many he remains "a Hebrew of Hebrews,"‡ and such mysticism as he reveals, will by them be traced back, not to Hellenism, but to the elements of mysticism which undoubtedly existed in the Judaism of his time, a mysticism akin to Philo's. It seems clear that there was in St. Paul's day a traditional Jewish mysticism which went under the name of Hasiduth—*i.e.*, enthusiastic godliness. Its trend was decidedly mystical. But it is also important to note that there had been ever since the time of Samuel a decided mixture of mysticism in Judaism. We can see traces of it in the books of the prophets, and

* Tarsus contained not only Greek, but still more fully Oriental elements, and a large Jewish colony. Hellenism was there largely swallowed up by Orientalism. Tarsus was the seat of a great university, and the home of Stoicism, and at a later time the centre of a Mithraic cult.

† "How far the Christian Church stood from the ideas of the Oriental cults is written on every page of the Gospels, and as one learns more of what the cults taught, and of the ideas and preconceptions in which they worked . . . the bright independence of Jesus of Nazareth grows in significance" (Glover, *Progress in Religion*, p. 328).

‡ The article is omitted in Phil. iii. 5, R.V.

especially in Ezekiel. These become more distinct in Apocalyptic literature, and we find constant references to visions and revelations, affording close parallels to St. Paul's ecstatic experiences in 2 Cor. xii. 4. Ezra and the Wisdom of Solomon will supply other instances. It therefore seems superfluous to seek the source of St. Paul's mysticism among the mystery religions, when it may perfectly well be derived from Judaism.* On the other hand, while the strongest influence in St. Paul's life was the Old Testament, we must remember that his Bible was a Greek, and not a Hebrew one, and the LXX. must have exercised a strong Hellenistic influence over him.

St. Paul was a man of cosmopolitan character, and quite independent enough to accept truth from whatever quarter it came. He was too many-sided a character to be capable of any very simple explanation, such as, on the one side, Schweitzer would offer in confining him to Hebraism, or Reitzenstein and Loisy, on the other, in making Hellenism his spiritual home. Therefore it is not of vital importance, any more than it is indeed possible, to try and balance accurately the Jewish and Greek elements either in the Judaism of St. Paul's day, or in the Christianity of the Apostle. Montefiore speaks, in *Judaism and St. Paul*, of the "cheap and poor Hellenistic Judaism from which Paul was converted to a belief in Jesus the Messiah."

We may add that B. W. Bacon takes the view that

* *Cf.* Maurice Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 139 *f.*, where fuller treatment will be found.

Paul's experience was "not so much that of a Palestinian Jew as that of a Hellenist, one whose whole idea of 'redemption' has been unconsciously universalized, individualized, and spiritualized, by contact with Greek and Hellenistic thought:" . . . "It is hopeless to deny the contrast between the gospel of Paul and the gospel of 'the apostles and elders at Jerusalem.' Whereas the Jewish-Christian had as its principal background the national history, more or less transcendentalized in the forms of apocalypse, Paul's had as its principal background the speculative mythology of the Hellenistic world, more or less adapted to the forms of Judaism. . . . The beginnings of our religion were not a mere enlargement of Judaism by abolition of the barriers of the Law, but a fusion of the two great streams of religious thought distinctive of the Jewish and the Hellenistic world in a higher unity. Alexander's hoped-for 'marriage of Europe and Asia' was consummated at last in the field of religion itself" (*The Making of the New Testament*, pp. 51-53).

The question is often asked, Did Judaism, in spite of its power of assimilation, remain characteristically Judaistic, did it dominate Hellenism, or was it dominated by it? The power of absorbing and making part of itself is no sign of weakness in a religion, and it is one of the marks of the greatness of Christianity, which we regard as the completion of Judaism, that it has been found capable of doing this in regard to Hellenism as well as of Judaism. The Christian Temple combines in a glorious whole all that is highest and noblest in both of them, and (may we not add?) in other faiths as well—and in

the building of this Temple St. Paul was one of the chief master-builders.*

NOTE ON THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS AND THE MYSTERIES

What has been said about St. Paul's relations to the mystery religions as a whole applies with special force to the Christian Sacraments, and there is no need to treat them separately.† The parallels are obvious, but go but little beyond the resemblance found in both systems making use of lustrations and sacred meals. The tremendous cleavage arises in St. Paul's intensely moral and ethical valuation of Sacraments, and the necessary ingredient of the spiritual quality of faith. This is what Dr. Lake overlooks when he says that "Baptism for St. Paul and his readers is universally and unquestionably accepted as a mystery, a Sacrament which works *ex opere operato*."‡ There is always the possibility, which Bousset emphasizes, that Paulinism (in the Sacraments) is not the first step towards "Hellenizing," but that the process had begun at Antioch, and that he found sacramental theories and teaching already in operation (*cf. Kyrios Christos*).

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTER IX

SANDAY: *The Oracles of God*, 1891.

G. ANRICH: *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christenthum*, 1893.

L. R. FARNELL: *The Cults of the Greek States*, 1896–1909, vols. iii. and v., and art. "Mystery" in E.Br., xix. 117 *ff.*

DIETERICH: *Eine Mithres-Liturgie*, 1903.

* How far later Judaism was assimilated to Hellenism is a matter of discussion. Professor Siegfried says that this was so in Alexandria (*Jewish Ency.*, art. "Hellenism," vi. 336 f.). See also Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, i. 217, and Moritz Friedlander in *Die religiosen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums in Zeitalter Jesu* (1905). On the other side will be found Schürer in *History of Jewish People in Time of Jesus Christ*, fourth edition, pp. 136-139; *cf.* also J. Reinach, *Jewish Ency.*, art. "Diaspora," and G. H. Box, *The Church Quarterly*, October, 1922.

† For further information *cf.* M. Jones's *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 147 *ff.*, and *cf.* also *Ency. of Rel. and Ethics*, ii., p. 382. ‡ Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 385.

HEITMÜLLER: *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 1903.
REITZENSTEIN: *Poimandres*, 1904; *Die hellenischen Mysterien-Religionen*, 1910; and *Umgearbe Aufe*, 1920.
BIGG: *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, 1905.
PFLEIDERER: *Primitive Christianity*, 1906-11, E.T.
ADAMS: *Religious Teachers of Greece.*
J. HARRISON: *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 1908.
CUMONT: *The Mysteries of Mithra*, 1910, E.T.; *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, 1907.
KIRSOPP LAKE: *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 1911; *Landmarks of Early Christianity*, 1920.
JACKSON AND LAKE: *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1920.
PERCY GARDNER: *The Religious Experiences of St. Paul*, 1911.
J. G. FRAZER: *The Golden Bough*, parts iii. (1911) and iv.; *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 1907.
CLEMEN: *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*, 1912, E.T.; *Der Einfluss der Mysterien-Religionen auf das älteste Christentum*, 1913.
SCHWEITZER: *Geschichte des Paulinischen Forschung*, 1911; *Paul and his Interpreters*, 1912.
DEISSMANN: *St. Paul*, 1912, E.T.
H. A. A. KENNEDY, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, 1913.
M. JONES: *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, 1914; second edition, 1923.
LOISY: *Les Mystères Païens et le Mystère Chrétien*, 1914.
W. MORGAN: *The Religion and Theology of St. Paul*, 1917.
HASTINGS: *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, art. "Baptism."
INGE: *Outspoken Essays*, 1920; *Christian Mysticism*, 1897.
BOUSSET: *Kyrios Christos*, 1921.
GLOVER: *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, 1909; *Progress in Religion*, 1920.
EDWYN BEVAN: *Hellenism and Christianity*, 1921.
PATTERSON: *Mithraism and Christianity*, 1921.
E. MEYER: *Ursprung und Anfange des Christenthums*, 1921.
MACHEN: *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, 1921.
GORE: *Belief in Christ*, 1922; *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, 1924.
HEILER: *Der Katholizismus: seine Idee und seine Erscheinung*, 1923.

One of the most remarkable pieces of evidence in regard to the Mysteries will be found in *The Metamorphoses or Golden Ass of Apuleius*, English translation, 1910, Book XI., and in Samuel Dill's *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Empire* (pp. 71-75), 1898.

CHAPTER X

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE EARLY CHURCH

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER X

Consideration of Acts ii. 42, 46, 47. Verse 42 obviously has religious significance. Agelong significance of eating and drinking together. Recurrent table-fellowship of Jesus and His disciples. Qualification of "at home" in 46 and 47. Further stage at Troas, xx. 7, 11, with liturgical characteristics. Chain of "breaking of bread" in Jerusalem, Troas, Corinth. Eucharist and Agape. Lacunæ in our knowledge. Gradual development of Eucharist. St. Paul's contribution to this (1 Cor. xi.) reveals an epochal moment in the evolution. Result of argument of chapter on problem of book. Does gradual evolution of Eucharist or gradual conviction of the Apostles militate against institution? A possible synthesis. Parallels to growth of Christian Church, Baptism and Ministry. Application of words spoken to Peter in Upper Room. Opportunities the Apostles had of knowing and understanding. Danger of presumption on our part.

CHAPTER X

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE EARLY CHURCH

We have studied the Gospel narratives and St. Paul's references in 1 Cor. to see what answer they give to our question. Does the Acts of the Apostles throw any light upon it? Are there any traces of the rite among the early Christians, in the stage of the Church's life next after the Gospel story such as may strengthen our belief in Jesus having bequeathed it to His Church? There are two well-known references to the "breaking of bread" in Acts ii. In verse 42 we read: "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and the prayers."* As, without doubt, three out of the four factors in this verse denote distinctly religious actions, it would be hypercritical to withhold the same characteristic from the fourth—viz., the breaking of bread. And though we may not feel that we have grounds for considering it as a description of the Lord's Supper in the fully developed sense we usually attach to the term, it seems to denote it in the embryo state it had then reached. Eating and drinking have through the ages had a religious significance. In this sense, of course, the Eucharist had its germs

* *Cf.* Rackham's *Acts of Apostles*, pp. 35-40.

in pre-Christian times. They may be found in various symbolic usages, by which primitive as well as partly civilized peoples, Jews, Greeks, etc., have regarded the vital action of building up the body by eating, as parallel to the strengthening of the spirit by the assimilation of what they regard as coming from some superhuman source.

The disciples had often eaten and drunk with Jesus. No meal with Him was entirely destitute of not only a religious but a sacramental side; it was always hallowed through its prayer of thanksgiving, and we may venture to surmise that there would be a growing consciousness in His mind that in and through Him God was meaning to give to the world food that was meat indeed. Through this habitual intercourse the breaking of bread had acquired a religious character, while at the close of His life Jesus had hallowed and consecrated these common actions in a peculiarly solemn way in the Upper Chamber. Therefore, this early "breaking of bread" may be regarded as no ordinary meal, but as a distinct step in the gradual evolution of the Eucharist. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that in verses 46 and 47 of the same chapter we have a similar expression, "breaking bread," qualified by the addition "at home." This distinction shows that the words cannot carry the same fullness of meaning as they appear to do in verse 42, though even here, since fellowship is in itself religious, and this was distinctly a mark of Christian fellowship, it certainly is not altogether devoid of religious significance. The solemn and more occasional "breaking of bread" in verse 42 would have

its effect upon the daily breaking of bread in verse 46, and the latter would prepare the way for the former, while both had behind them the Master's example and influence. We are further justified in believing that we are right in these conclusions, when some years later we read of the "breaking of the bread" at Troas (xx. 7, 11). Here there is much to point to what may be regarded as a further stage in the development of the Eucharist, and even as an established weekly custom. It takes place on a Sunday, and the whole atmosphere seems to be that of a religious service. There are many lights, showing not only careful preparation, but possibly also, steps taken to rebut the charge, which we know was early made, of excesses accompanying the Lord's Supper. There is St. Paul's long discourse, and the language of verse 11 about St. Paul breaking bread suggests something of the nature of a liturgical action performed by a single person as president, and there is no clear indication of an ordinary meal, though such may have accompanied the more solemn breaking of bread. This "breaking of the bread"* may, therefore, well be the central feature of a regular weekly gathering for worship. And when we recall that Troas was a Pauline Church and connect the narrative with 1 Cor. xi., and reflect that St. Paul's language there implies that he would have given similar teaching to his converts elsewhere, we have definite ground for linking this Troas gathering to the commemoration of the Lord's death, inaugurated at the Last Supper, and

* Goguel and some others think this was an Agape combined with the Eucharist (*L'Eucharistie*, p. 142).

for concluding that by this time it has become the central rite of the early Christian worship.* We do not feel that we are justified in attaching to "the breaking of the bread" in Jerusalem, in Acts ii., all the ideas we may connect with this Eucharist at Troas, or the one at Corinth, but even in Jerusalem it was far more than a merely social meal and had a real connection with the Supper in the Upper Room. We feel sure that the general course of history will thus be most easily explained, and that the germ of the later conceptions of the Eucharist was contained in these earlier "breakings of bread." There is no sufficient reason for supposing that St. Paul's Churches differed to any large extent in their uses from other Churches, and the available facts are best explained by the supposition that, from the beginning, Christians commemorated their Master at a common meal.† It does not belong to our subject to discuss whether, on these occasions, the whole meal was a communion, or whether communion took place during or after the meal. The relation of the Eucharist to the Agape (or Love Feast) is still obscure, but it does not affect our special enquiry. We are merely attempting to discover the origin of the solemn "breaking of the bread," which became so intimate a part of the life of the primitive Christian Church,

* Though the New Testament references are of an incidental character, they imply that the rite was a recognized part of the Christian life—*e.g.*, "as often as ye eat" (1 Cor. xi.), and "till He come." This agrees with indications in the Acts of its place in the habitual round of the life of the early Christians.

† See *Dict. of Ap. Ch.*, art. "Eucharist," by G. H. Clayton, p. 374.

and to determine its relation on the one side to the Last Supper, and on the other to the fuller development of the Eucharist as it emerges in St. Paul's writings, and subsequently appears in the sub-Apostolic Fathers. The Acts of the Apostles does not help us further in filling up the lacunæ which remain. The author's object was not to trace processes, but to record the spread and triumph of the Gospel. It shows us Christianity in action, grappling with the issues of life. We arrive, then, at the following conclusions: Probably from an early period in the ministry, some form of common meal had been shared between Jesus and His disciples, which had been sacramental in its character. Jesus, as a Jewish house-father, had often, in His own striking way, blessed bread and wine, imparting to them a sacramental value, and using them to witness to *koinonia* or fellowship. Doubtless He had explained the symbolism of the loaf as well as of the wine (*cf.* St. John vi. and xv.), and the disciples had learnt of these as symbols of union with, and of dependence on God for spiritual nourishment. On the night before He died He had done this in a peculiarly impressive way, and with unique utterances, connecting them moreover with distinct Paschal associations. After His death His disciples continued these common meals, which helped to deepen and hallow this fellowship, and were naturally reminiscent of meals Jesus had shared with them. Some of these were daily, and though not strictly sacramental, were quasi-sacramental. Some of them were at longer intervals, and before long took place on "the first day of the week." These were more

distinctly sacramental. All had to be held in Christian houses, and at first there was nothing very formal, and nothing which could be described as ecclesiastical about them. They might seem almost as ordinary as the domestic supper, the presiding member hallowing the meal with prayer, but no priestly act being involved. But as time passed, and the Christian community grew, and with it new needs arose, and when Gentile "God-fearers" were received into the fraternity by Baptism, such observances necessarily became more regulated. When St. Paul's journeys brought him into pagan surroundings, and he found people of a different outlook and circumstances, whose training had brought them into contact with heathen mysteries, he, impelled by the Spirit of Jesus, feeling that the growing Church needed Sacraments, and realizing that what had been done in the Upper Room was capable of infinite expansion, found therein the genesis and intention of a true supply of those needs, and, like a wise master-builder, matched the Sacraments to the requirements of his converts. This may throw light upon some of the more definite sacramental expressions of the Apostle, for though the place of Sacraments in his teaching is, at times, obscure, yet it is very definite, and though he says but little about them, a good deal is said in that little. In 1 Cor. xi. we find ourselves at one of the epochal moments in the evolution of this Sacrament, for irregularities at Corinth had become so scandalous that St. Paul is driven to suggest that the Corinthians' own houses, and not the special house chosen for the sacred

communal meal, are the proper places in which to eat and drink, and he seems to indicate the need of a change of setting for the Lord's Supper. We are, therefore, prepared to find, when we have later evidence, that the Eucharist and the common meal have become separated.

But this was but one illustration ot growth and adaptation to circumstances. The Eucharist was a live thing and therefore bound to grow. As the Judæo-Christian circles widened to take in the Jews of the Diasporæ, proselytes and finally pure Gentiles, and the process was very gradual—so the doctrine and practices of the Sacraments developed also. In Asia Minor the complete doctrine formulated itself early, in conflict with Jews on the one hand and Hellenists on the other, while intercourse with votaries of the various Greek mysteries encouraged and influenced the growing Christian sacramental theory and practice.

It is evident that the suggestions in this chapter as to the gradual process by which the Eucharist arose out of certain table intercourse, or those again as to the gradual realization of the disciples of the rich heritage Jesus had bestowed upon them in the Upper Room, in no way militate against the fact of an institution, if on sufficiently reliable grounds that fact can be established, or even if it can be shown to be highly probable. They seem, indeed, to make it more probable, and also to offer a synthesis between views which might at first sight be regarded as contradictory, but may after all be found to be complementary. They help to reconcile the probable gradual evolution of the Eucharist,

with the clear belief of the Early Church that Jesus had created a new rite. And in this they present a striking parallel to the way the Christian Church arose out of the Jewish Church (*cf.* Chap. IV.), and Christian Baptism became the spiritual heir of Jewish Baptism (*ibid.*), while they afford also analogies with what we know of the rise of the Christian ministry. Each is an instance of growth and development from apparently humble earthly origins, till in the fullness of time each finds its destined and glorious completion in its proper place in the Kingdom of God, while that aspect of God's method of working is further illustrated in the particular case before us, by our Lord's consecration of the lowly elements of bread and wine to such exalted ends.

When, again, we suggest that the meaning and claims of the Eucharist were only gradually perceived and responded to, we have additional grounds for assurance that the conclusions at length reached by the Apostles were correct and balanced ones. We need not hesitate to apply certain words spoken by Jesus that same night about another sacramental action of His, to our subject also. He said to Peter about the feet-washing, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt understand hereafter." Would not those words be fulfilled also about the bestowal of His Body and His Blood? Would the disciples be able to "know" at the time—amidst all the bewilderment of that crowded hour—what He meant, or would they need time and thought, and subsequent united gatherings in that Upper Room for prayer and fellowship, before they

could be said to "understand"? Would it not become clear to them by degrees that Jesus had both given them more, and demanded more of them, than they knew at first? Would not the fuller understanding of these mysteries require the mental and spiritual acumen of a Paul and a John with their Christ affinities?

The process of this increasing consciousness is naturally hidden from us. We are vouchsafed a glimpse at the moment the words were originally spoken. Again, we see the disciples wisely keeping open the channels of revelation, as "they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of the bread and the prayers." Again, in 1 Cor. xi. we find the position more clearly grasped and interpreted. And all these are consistent one with another. The backward glance we have taken, fits in, without any forced effort, with the forward one. They all agree with the construction finally put upon them by the Church. Moreover, if we stress the opening words of Jesus to Peter, demanding that time should be given to "understand" what He was doing, we must equally stress the assurance of the latter half of the saying, "Thou shalt understand hereafter." It is a distinct promise. If, in this twentieth century, we dispute the interpretation which Peter and his fellow Apostles put upon their Master's conduct that night, we run counter to these words, and we overlook the help of the Holy Spirit which was attached to the promise. The Apostles may not have been highly educated men according to our present-day standards, but they had qualifications

for spiritual apprehension which vastly surpass intellectual acquirements. They had been brought up in the *milieu* of Jewish rites and ceremonies, and subsequently they had companied with Jesus for a considerable period. They knew His attitude to those rites and ceremonies, and were capable of discriminating between what He intended them to adopt as a custom (viz., the Holy Communion) and what He merely used as a passing example for future conduct (viz., the feet-washing). Would it not seem presumptuous on our part to think they might be mistaken when they retained the one for regular use, and regarded the other only as a parable of mutual service? Not only did they fail to perpetuate the feet-washing, but, except in Acts xxi. 24, we do not hear of their observing any further Jewish sacrifices; while, on the other hand, we do find them practising a sacred meal, and carefully handing it down unimpaired to after generations. Such reflections corroborate the other grounds we have discovered for the reality of an institution.

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTER X

It seems unnecessary to mention special literature for this chapter, but, of course, further information may be had from the various articles in Dictionaries, etc., already referred to, or from Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles, or early Church Histories.

CHAPTER XI

REVIEW AND CONCLUSIONS

NOTE ON THE "PRAYER OF CONSECRATION"

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER XI

Limits to present knowledge of subject. Trend of recent research. Holy Communion is a great testimony to the truth of Christianity. Throws light upon the threefold ministry. The two ways of approach to subject. The way adopted here. The New Testament forces the problem upon us and challenges us to search. Need of both "lower criticism" and "higher criticism" in the endeavour. Necessity of effort on our part. The results of modern research do not disappoint us. Review of what we have attempted. Holy Communion a farewell and a starting-point. Increasing knowledge of Scripture not weaken our belief, and early Church tradition strengthens it. No Eucharistic formula at first. Disappointment to those whose minds set on objectivity. Yet abundant evidence of right sort. Pragmatical test of Holy Communion. Psychological test. The test of experience.

Note on "The Prayer of Consecration."

Note on The Covenant Idea.

CHAPTER XI

REVIEW AND CONCLUSIONS

It is not yet possible for the final word to be spoken on several of the questions raised in the foregoing pages. The writer's object has been to indicate the trend of recent reverent research. He hopes others will carry the investigation further. The subject is of such vital importance that it is impossible to overrate the value of the witness of the unbroken observance of the Holy Communion during nearly twenty centuries. This is in itself a tremendous testimony to the truth of Christianity. "Earliest of all the records, in fact coeval with the utterance of the Master, is the Sacrament itself."* If no Gospels or Epistles or contemporary writings had come down to us, yet the Eucharist would remain as an unchallengeable proof of the historical continuity of our religion. It has been celebrated from the very beginning, and for it every Christian Church has been built. It will also be found to throw much light upon the problem of the threefold ministry, because from very early times the two have been indissolubly connected.

A student may approach it in two ways, both of them historical:

1. Just as a geologist, discovering certain fossils,

* B. W. Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, p. 51.

works back from them to the earlier causes which placed them in position, so the student may make his starting-point with Justin Martyr (A.D. 153) or Irenæus (A.D. 180), and work back to earlier traces at Troas (A.D. 60), at Corinth (A.D. 50), at Jerusalem (A.D. 30);* or, secondly, he may reverse the process, and starting with the New Testament records may trace the gradual development outward to these patristic writers.† We have adopted the latter course, and it is now time to bring our enquiry to an end, to sum up what our study has shown us, and to ask whether our survey has brought us any satisfaction. We have considered, from one point of view only, the real significance of the meal in the Upper Room. Did Jesus intend it to be in any form repeated, or has that feature been ascribed to Him at a later stage? So far as the New Testament goes, while the Synoptists record the actual story of the Supper, only St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xi., gives any definite phrases of institution. Did he originate the institution? Again, the Fourth Gospel speaks of sacramental values which lie behind Holy Communion as we know it. Does such teaching derive its origin from Jesus Himself?

We have seen that it is not we who are raising the question. The question is knocking rather loudly at our door, and though our ears may only recently have heard the sound, the problem has been there ever since the New Testament was written. It is the very nature of the Gospel narratives which raises it. If we had but one Gospel, and if the text had

* Batiffol's method in his latest edition of *L'Eucharistie* (1920).

† Goguel's method.

been transmitted with accuracy, the problem would be comparatively simple. But the Holy Spirit has not so willed it. So far as we can penetrate into the mind of God, it does not seem presumptuous to say that apparently He has felt that the revelation He would vouchsafe of His Son, would be impoverished rather than enlarged if we possessed a merely phonographic record of His words. Therefore any such idea as a report by shorthand writing is not applicable here; nor are we to expect from the Evangelists the standard of verbal accuracy which we are accustomed to demand* from a modern writer. We are given various narratives, but they are not expressed in identical terms. We may follow Mark, or Matthew, or Luke, or Paul, but seeing that ancient authorities differ one from another, we are obliged to discriminate, using the "lower criticism" to discover the true text, and also the "higher criticism" to determine what were the actual words, actions, and meanings of Jesus.† And should anyone ask whether it has been worth while to raise the problem rather than leave it slumbering, partly because at the close we may have no very different reply to make from the one we have long been accustomed to, and perhaps no absolutely certain reply at all, we may appeal to the necessity laid upon us of responding to truths and facts freshly discovered. Moreover, we may fairly claim to have shown that the best modern research has in no way disposed of, nor even can be

* This is by no means to imply that we get it, as will be apparent to any who read two different newspaper reports of the same speech!

† *Cf. Church Quarterly*, January, 1923, pp. 321, 324.

quoted as in opposition to, our ancient and cherished beliefs. We laid down certain principles at the outset, the chief of which was that we must make the search for truth paramount, and also that the best way of approach to the subject is by the door of historical enquiry. And we first of all applied these methods to the questions of eschatology and institutionalism in so far as they affect our subject. Here we discovered no *a priori* reasons for a negative reply, and much which pointed in an opposite direction. In reviewing the Gospel records of the event, having carefully weighed the value we ought to attach to the silence of the Synoptists and St. John, we were led to conclude that if there is nothing which quite definitely indicates an institution, there is nothing which can be said to disallow it. Moreover, the fuller record of St. Luke, even if not part of the original text, yet carries very high authority on the positive side. We devoted several chapters to St. Paul, investigating his claim to speak with authority, his relation to Jesus, his presumed acquaintance with the heathen mysteries, and the marks of development in his sacramental teaching. In particular we tried to appraise at their true value the " words of institution," which he ascribes to Jesus, asking whether they are to be regarded as a literal report, or as a careful formula and summary which was in use, and which represented what he was persuaded was the intention of Jesus. This was no easy problem, because what may now be described as " the sanctity of inverted commas " was not then invented, and honest and trustworthy Greek historians had very different literary standards from

our own. We concluded, therefore, that while some devout Christians may feel obliged to accept the words with a note of interrogation, yet they may confidently hold that they make explicit what was already implicit in the mind of Jesus. We saw that we may with confidence conclude (1) that the Eucharist is based on some Jewish rite or custom then existing, and that it continued in its new Christian form to have certain associations and meanings attached to that rite (see Chaps. VI. and X.); (2) that a new and specifically Christian significance was given to the rite in the very earliest Christian days; (3) that the way of observing the rite, and the meanings which have been attached to it, have developed and grown by degrees. We saw also that it has been the belief of the Church from the Apostolic age onwards that the Eucharist was instituted by Jesus, that this tradition was accepted in both Jewish and Gentile Churches, and that it is extremely unlikely that a mistake can herein have been made. The idea, therefore, of a mere parting meal which was altered and changed by the Christian Church after the Death and Resurrection of Jesus, will not satisfy the situation. At the same time, conceptions of elaborate ceremonial, either of the Passover (for the Last Supper was not the actual Passover meal) or of later Eucharistic celebrations, have to be put aside. We must fix our thoughts upon a simpler ritual and the usual surroundings of ordinary Jewish meals, sanctified by a thanksgiving pronounced over the bread and wine, such as Jesus had often made use of in earlier days. Nevertheless, it is clear that this was in every sense a unique occasion,

and was accompanied by actions, gestures, looks, utterances, all of which suggested and emphasized this uniqueness. It was not only the last occasion when Jesus was to share with His disciples this sacred table-fellowship, which had come to have so sacramental an import. But He was here to unite them to Himself, imparting to them His Body and His Blood, with all that was therewith implied, speaking those most challenging and pregnant words "This is My Body," and describing His Blood as being shed to unite them in a covenant with God. Therefore this was a new starting-point as well as a farewell, a beginning as well as an ending, the institution of an abiding Sacrament as well as the fulfilling of religious institutions of the past. And the very diversity of meanings attached to it by the Church, bears witness to its being so framed as to wait for fuller interpretation, some part of which we find in St. Paul, and some part in St. John, but much of which was to be discovered later.* When we went on to enquire how the scanty references to the "breaking of bread" in the Acts, and the undoubted custom found to be prevailing in the early Church, could be most satisfactorily accounted for, we saw that the belief among the first generations of Christians that Jesus had intended them to continue His memorial was strong, and we feel that in a true sense this belief contributes

* *Cf.* Dean J. A. Robinson, *Ency. Brit.*, art. "Eucharist." It was not for several centuries that exact definitions were formulated, or any minute application made of words to things. The minds of believers ranged freely among various ideas. The Eucharist is many-sided.

more reliable evidence than any other. The disciples clearly did not invent the tradition. They were not likely to have misinterpreted Christ's meaning. Had the Church done this, those who were most intimate with Jesus, could and would have corrected the mistake. Any other conclusion would be difficult to reconcile with the promise Jesus made about the Holy Spirit's guiding His disciples into all the truth. By these and other paths we were led to find firm ground for the custom and the belief behind it. And inasmuch as the real need is not for any actual formula or command—though such may perfectly well have been given either at the time or later, or, indeed, at any time during the sacred and intimate intercourse before or after the Resurrection—but for the assurance of our Lord's intention, we feel that increasing knowledge of Scripture does not weaken, but strengthens the New Testament evidence, and that what is lacking there is well supplied by early Church tradition. That we find no Eucharistic formula clearly given by Jesus, that we have to admit that there is no record of any actual "words of institution" (to use a later phrase) having been used by the earliest Christians, may at first seem disappointing. We know "the intensity with which the religious mind craves to rest its convictions on the bedrock of objective truth," and we are familiar with those who conceive of "unbroken tradition as purely static, a mechanical unpacking, as Father Tyrrell puts it, of the doctrines once delivered to the Apostles";* but we claim that we have here, not

* Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, vol. i., last page.

only enough objectivity, but a nobler because a more spiritual measure and kind of revelation. So while certain points are not capable of an unquestionable solution, and an element of conjecture is left; while about some of the details we can only use "probably" and "apparently,"* because our records do not furnish data for choosing finally between two or more possible explanations, we feel that it is true to say that no one can get into the mind of the Christian Church without being convinced of the quality as well as the quantity of evidence for the truth of the institution of Holy Communion by Jesus. St. Paul and all the branches of the Church from the beginning are witnesses hard to gainsay. In what we have said, we have purposely confined ourselves somewhat severely to historical evidence. This was incumbent upon us because we set out to investigate the fact of the institution rather than the significance of the fact, or the doctrines involved in it. The one necessarily precedes the other; but, on the other hand, it has no value except so far as it leads on to the other. For "it is on ethical rather than on metaphysical grounds that doctrines are defended to-day, and there is an increasing ethical tone of speculation and of the current philosophy of values. No belief, however Scriptural we can prove it to be, however

* Lord Morley, who died Sept. 23, 1923, said in his old age that "perhaps" was a great word, and that we are reading Montaigne still because of his liking for such words of caution as "perhaps," and "probably" and "it may be." . . . There is a "perhaps" that comes not of vagueness but of the desire for greater precision, as there is a scepticism that comes not of unfaith, but of faith. *Cf.* art. in *The Times*, Sept. 27, 1923.

venerable the ecclesiastical authority by which it has been promulgated, can claim the serious attention of thoughtful men and women to-day merely because it is Scriptural, primitive, and Catholic. There must be also, at least, a *prima facie* probability that its acceptance will make some actual and appreciable difference for the better in our comprehension of the meaning of the universe and our capacity to live our lives and develop our personalities in conformity with the self-evident values of beauty, truth, and goodness."*

We cannot therefore end, without a forward glance at the history which the Eucharist was destined to make and has since made.

By so doing our faith may be strengthened, because we may be more and more fully persuaded that Holy Communion is not only rooted in historical facts, but that it has been tested and approved by permanent and God-implanted intuitions, and by constantly repeated experiences of the human spirit. Now we may say without hesitation that, regarded from the pragmatical standpoint, Holy Communion has abundantly proved its value. God would seem to have stamped His approval upon the instinct which led the disciples of Jesus to regard it as their Master's last sacred behest, and as something to be done in remembrance of Him. In 1856 Archbishop Temple said, "We are in need of, and we are being gradually forced into, a theology based on psychology." Similar teaching is flooding in upon us to-day, and thus we in the twentieth

* R. G. Parsons, the *Modern Churchman*, Sept., 1921, p. 301.

century are learning, as if it was a new teaching, one of the secrets of our Lord's successful dealings with men. If, then, one great test of our epoch is "the transference of Christianity from history to psychology," from the region of external authority to the region of internal experience and conduct, perhaps the most convincing proofs (if such be possible) of the institution, will be found not in the testimony of St. Paul or of the early Church, but in the potent influence Holy Communion has exercised, and in the determinative factor it has become, in human history.* "The only invincible evidence of Truth is its own truth."† The more we meditate on Holy Communion, the more we know it is true. "We have to distinguish truth from merely the actual 'that which is.' The truth of any form of life, even a plant, is not whatever it happens to be, but what it ought to be and must be in order to be itself."‡ When we remember that Christianity does not rest on the authenticity of a particular incident, but on the underlying truth to the facts of human nature mirrored in that incident, and that, as Ritschl has reminded us, the soul of man has a faculty enabling him to judge what is of religious value for itself, and that this operation makes it act in a way involving certitude; and, above all, when we apply the test of experience, rather than that of authority or history, the *novum*

* "We define that to be the nature of a thing which the thing becomes when it is perfected" (Aristotle, *Politics*, I. i., 1252*b*, 30).

† Du Bose, *The Constructive Quarterly*, art. "Resurrection," Dec., 1916.

‡ *Ibid.*

organum scientiæ, the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti*, or the witness of spiritual life down through the Christian ages, during which, without a break or interruption, Holy Communion has proved its value, we shall more and more rest satisfied with the conclusion to which we have been led, and shall constantly marvel afresh at the loving wisdom of Jesus "when, amidst the tension of that solemn hour, He rose, gathered up the meaning of His whole life into a symbolic act so eloquent and yet so simple, and offered Himself, even in His death, to His disciples, as the very life of their lives."

NOTE ON THE "PRAYER OF CONSECRATION" IN THE PRAYER BOOK

In our Anglican Prayer Book, and in a large number of ancient and modern Liturgies, we find words which at first sight seem for their truthfulness to depend upon St. Paul's witness about "the words of institution." The question arises as to our position, if we were clearly persuaded that the words of 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, were not to be regarded as strictly historical. We do not see that it need in any degree affect our use of the Prayer. So long as we feel, as we certainly may, and as almost all devout scholars do, that St. Paul had proper authority from the Christian Church for the statement, and that it rightly conveys the mind and intention of Jesus, we may well rest content to use the words which bring us as near the actual facts of the case as in God's providence we can get at present. Our study has shown us that the Prayer of Consecration, so far as it attempts to reproduce the words spoken in the Upper Room, is a mosaic of the four different Scriptural versions of the event, and that a perfect harmony of them is not now possible. It is also well to remember that the term "Gospel" ("in His holy Gospel command us to continue") implies in liturgical usage the New Testament revelation as a whole, and not necessarily one of our four Gospels, though by the time the words were used liturgic-

ally, the longer text of St. Luke would have been in common use. It is interesting to notice that in one of the versions recently offered for Prayer Book revision, commonly called "The Grey Book," the following alteration has been suggested: "and did institute a perpetual memory of Himself, and by His holy Apostle has taught us to show forth His precious death until He come."

THE COVENANT IDEA

It may be noted that in the foregoing pages little has been said about our Lord's "Covenant" words at the Last Supper. This silence is not based upon Goguel's view, "la tradition primitive sur le dernier nepas ne connaisait pas la coupe d'alliance" (*L'Eucharistie*, p. 86), nor on the view of W. H. Cadman, that "the reason Jesus alleges 'in memory of Me,' or 'for My memorial,' is strange and difficult to accept in connection with the making of a covenant through a rite of communion" (*The Last Journey of Jesus*, p. 147, 1924), both of which statements are highly controversial. This saying attributed to Jesus is doubtless of great interest, but it does not seem to affect the argument of this book.

CHAPTER XII

EPILOGUE

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER XII

Some final considerations. Solemn character of the questions raised. Responsibility of raising them. Some have tried to dissuade author from doing it. Reasons for persevering. Search for truth. Results of fuller knowledge. A higher doctrine of institution. The common view about it quite inadequate. Lends itself to magic and "hearing Mass." How to capture the spirit of Jesus. Lessons of table-fellowship. Eucharist a challenge. What Jesus really meant. Did St. Paul interpret rightly? History *versus* Interpretation. The Holy Spirit may work through both. The importance of the outward observance of the rite. Loss by neglecting this. Still greater importance of joining the inner to the outer.

CHAPTER XII

EPILOGUE

HAVING now, within the limits set by this volume, endeavoured to make a candid enquiry into the arguments for and against our subject, I venture to offer—for any who care to read them—one or two considerations, which have presented themselves during the years of busy parochial life, in the intervals of which I have attempted to study and write upon this subject, availing myself also of every reasonable opportunity of discussing it with others. Quite clearly in a subject of such magnitude, coming to us across the centuries, touching questions which hold an infinitude of solemn meaning for every Christian soul, personal considerations can count for nothing, but only the unfettered pursuit of truth. At the same time parochial work emphasizes in a special way the tremendous responsibility which attaches to propounding problems which by their impact on the minds of others, may seem to suggest doubt or to unsettle faith, and not a few of those whom I have consulted, have regarded my determination to discuss this question as akin to sacrilege. When some years ago I discovered that any treatise on the subject would have to start with setting out the apparently strong negative arguments which can be adduced, and with a frank consideration of

them, I was nevertheless encouraged to persevere by the assurance I felt that a nearer approach to truth always means a nearer approach to God. That assurance has grown as I have pursued my enquiry, and I hope that to others besides myself fuller knowledge may mean a fuller revelation of truth. My own firm belief is that the result of our study has been to establish a higher and more satisfying doctrine of "institution" than the ordinary one. The common view of it which attributes to Jesus the intention of creating an external rite or ceremony—something to be done ceremonially—and laying upon His disciples the perpetual obligation of continuing it, that thereby His memory might be preserved and handed down to after generations, seems to me meagre and unsatisfying. At the best it embodies a very small portion of the truth, and if we make it the most prominent feature,* it is not easy to reconcile with what we know of Jesus. It clearly lends itself to a magical use of certain words and actions, as is exemplified in certain large portions of the Christian Church, which from the second century have been greatly influenced by the mystery cults, and also to a false idea that it is "hearing Mass" which matters most. Not so can we hope to capture the true spirit of Jesus at that memorable Last Supper, and to discover His meaning, while from the institutional point of view we shall seek in vain so long as our chief search is for some dogmatic

* This is not meant to question St. Paul's interpretation of our Lord's purpose, when he writes "Do this in remembrance of Me," but only to point to a deeper sense of the meaning of the words.

injunction from Him. If, on the other hand, we believe that Jesus having during constant table-fellowship familiarized His disciples with, and inculcated in them, the spirit of the common meal, and thus having brought them into communion with Himself and with each other, finally with solemn words and actions, on the night before He died, pledged them and His future Church to take their share—however humble a one—with Him in His approaching Passion, with all that Passion involved, it becomes a vastly different proposition. If He meant, as I believe He did, not only to invite them to break bread and share a cup with Him, but thereby to share also His sacrifice, of which these were symbols, taking their part in what He was doing for the world, that seems to me to fit in with our conception of Him and of His usual methods. This I hold to be an institution in the highest and noblest sense, suitable to be enshrined in the very innermost life of His Church, and capable of indefinite expansion. I read His words as an invitation, rather than a command, though, of course, an invitation from Him is a command—to join Him in what He was then setting out to do—viz., offering His Body and Blood for the world's salvation. The disciples were to be ready to offer theirs, to drink of His cup, to be baptised with His baptism, to die with Him, and to rise again; and the Church was increasingly to learn this lesson,* for as her members continued their table-fellowship after His death, the meaning of it would come home to them more and more. And it is

* 1 Cor. xi. 26; and *cf.* Col. i. 24.

in this sense that I believe St. Paul rightly interpreted his Master's mind when he put into His lips "Do this in remembrance of Me."* We have seen that we have to beware of thinking that there need be less of inspiration in interpretation than in historical narrative. In seeking reassurance for our faith we are apt to crave for documentary evidence, but God does not always vouchsafe it to us. On the other hand, there may be equal validity in the interpretation which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, St. Paul and the early Church put upon our Lord's action in the Upper Room, as in the plainest directions He might have given, but, being what He was, was unlikely to give. Why should not an institution which is dependent upon the witness of St. Paul and of the entire early Church be as valid and well authenticated as one vouched for by St. Mark or St. Luke? We must remember that "all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as He will."

Finally, let us beware of thinking that such a conception of institution in any way depreciates the importance of the regular and outward observance of the rite. We owe that external setting to our Lord Himself. It was He who endowed it with a body as well as a soul. It was He who attached sacramental values to bread and wine. It was He who identified them with His Body and His Blood. The outward casket was provided by Jesus to carry the inward jewel. That the outward

* I have tried to amplify these thoughts in *Steps towards Intercommunion, Sacrifice in Holy Communion*, pp. 51 *ff.*

observance of the rite has been wisely cherished and taught by the Church among almost all communities of Christians, I believe to be due to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Who led the first disciples to "continue steadfastly in the breaking of the bread." Thoughtful people know how much they lose, both for themselves and in their example to others, if they neglect such external means of grace. On the other hand, while both aspects of the rite are fittingly conjoined, not only is the outward observance in itself of small avail without the inner meaning, but doubtless the latter has been and is at times attained where the former is lacking. If we stress the fact of the institution, and of its accompanying obligations, let us beware lest the inward response of our daily life fails to correspond with the visible and external expressions of the Sacrament, or lest in spiritual fullness we lag behind those who think they can dispense with such aid.